Pradman Krishan Dhar,
Headmaster:

Pradman Dhar

August, 74

Leh (Ladakh):

Lachman Krishan Dhar
Headmaster.

GANDHI

HIS RELEVANCE FOR OUR TIMES

EDITORS

G. RAMACHANDRAN
T.K. MAHADEVAN

1967

Gandhi

HIS RELEVANCE FOR OUR TIMES

G.M. College of Education
Raipur, Bantalab
Jammu.
Acc. No....2344 (D)
Dated 4/11/2015

GANDHI PEACE FOUNDATION, NEW DELHI
BHARATIYA VIDYA BHAVAN, BOMBAY

REVISED AND
ENLARGED
SECOND EDITION

COPYRIGHT ©
GANDHI PEACE FOUNDATION

PRINTED IN INDIA
AT KAPUR PRINTING PRESS, DELHI

[illegible]
Headmaster
August; 1981
Leh Ladakh

PREFACE

To be wholly fruitful, the study of Gandhi should be more than historical; it should be brought closer to our times and shown in relation to the needs and challenges of the nuclear age. This is one of the major preoccupations of the Gandhi Peace Foundation; and within limits, this is what the present book has attempted to do.

The limited first edition of the book was designed and produced as a presentation to Dr R.R. Diwakar, Chairman of the Foundation, on his seventieth birthday. The present edition is a considerably revised and enlarged one, and is in many ways a more unified volume of studies. Some of the new material had first appeared in the pages of *Gandhi Marg*, the quarterly journal of the Foundation.

Our chief thanks are due to the many writers on Gandhian themes who have made this volume possible; they have been unstinting in their cooperation. We should also like to thank the Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan for collaborating with us in the publication of the book; and Smt. Meera Mahadevan for reading the proofs and compiling the index.

G. Ramachandran
T.K. Mahadevan

Gandhi Peace Foundation
New Delhi

CONTENTS

PROLOGUE

R.R. Diwakar: The Relevance of Gandhi *ix*

SECTION ONE

William Stuart Nelson: The Tradition of Nonviolence and its Underlying Forces *3*
Gene Sharp: A Study of the Meanings of Nonviolence *21*
William Robert Miller: Notes on the Theory of Nonviolence *67*
James E. Bristol: Nonviolence as a Positive Concept *80*
William Robert Miller: Experimentation in Nonviolence: the Next Phase *87*

SECTION TWO

Joan V. Bondurant: Satyagraha versus Duragraha: the Limits of Symbolic Violence *99*
Richard B. Gregg: The Best Solver of Conflicts *113*
K.M. Munshi: The Spiritual Basis of Satyagraha *120*
Richard B. Gregg: Satyagraha as a Mirror *124*
Kenneth E. Boulding: Why Did Gandhi Fail? *129*

SECTION THREE

Gene Sharp: Gandhi's Political Significance Today *137*
Stephen King-Hall: Violence and Power Politics *158*

A.J. Muste: India Yet Must Show the Way *164*
William Stuart Nelson: War and What Price Freedom *172*
Charles C. Walker: A Coordinated Approach to Disarmament *180*
T.K. Mahadevan: A Disarmament Adequate to Our Times *187*

SECTION FOUR

Charles C. Walker: The Impact of Gandhi on the U.S. Peace Movement *195*
A.J. Muste: Nonviolence and Mississippi *209*
Mulford Q. Sibley: Aspects of Nonviolence in American Culture *222*

SECTION FIVE

J.B. Kripalani: The Gandhian Approach to World Peace *239*
G. Ramachandran: The Grass-roots of World Peace *247*
Wilfred Wellock: Is There a Nonviolent Road to a Peaceful World? *253*
Horace Alexander: Nuclear Explosions and World Peace *261*
P.T. Raju: The Gandhian Way and Nuclear War *266*
Paul F. Power: A Gandhian Model for World Politics *281*
Ted Dunn: A Nonviolent International Authority *292*

SECTION SIX

K. Santhanam: Basic Principles of Gandhism *307*
B.S. Sharma: The Ideal and the Actual in Gandhi's Philosophy *311*
Raghavan N. Iyer: Means and Ends in Politics *320*
Agehananda Bharati: A Contemporary Interpretation of Ahimsa *333*
R.R. Diwakar: The True Spirit of Satyagraha *341*
Marie Beuzeville Byles: Gandhi through the Eyes of the Gita *348*
Esme Wynne-Tyson: Gandhi's Illustrious Antecedents *358*
R.R. Keithahn: Taking Sarvodaya to the People *368*

EPILOGUE

G. Ramachandran: The Essence of Gandhi *376*
Index *385*

PROLOGUE

THE RELEVANCE OF GANDHI

R.R. Diwakar

The moment the mighty figure of Gandhi rises before us, the question presents itself: What is his relevance today and for the future? What inspiration can we draw from his life? What light can his thought and wisdom shed on our problems? How does his way of life affect our course of action in private and public affairs? That Gandhi is relevant today and for centuries to come is not in doubt at all. The words which Jawaharlal Nehru uttered almost immediately after Gandhi's sudden exit from this world are found to prove prophetic. He said, The light is gone and yet it will shine for a thousand years. Dr Martin Luther King, Jr, the Nobel Peace Prize winner of U.S.A., came to India as a pilgrim in 1959. After a month's sojourn in the land of Gandhi, on the eve of his departure, he was asked a cynical question at a press conference in Delhi. Where is Gandhi today? he was asked: we see him nowhere. Dr King's reply was that Gandhi was inevitable. If humanity is to progress, Gandhi is inescapable. He lived, thought and acted, inspired by the vision of a humanity evolving towards a world of peace and harmony. We may ignore him only at our own risk.

The relevance of a man or his message can be said to have many aspects. It can be immediate or remote; it can be local, regional or general; it can be personally relevant to some or universally for all. In the case of Gandhi, all these aspects of his relevance can be studied with profit.

Man, in Gandhi's eyes, was the measure. Gandhi's approach to himself, and to life in general, was that of a seeker of truth and of a votary of nonviolence, or love. His was a scientific mind and he sought for that law of life and being which would promote the common weal and help man to reach higher elevations of consciousness. He perceived that love, spelt as nonviolence in thought, word and deed, was the shortest cut to human progress and evolution, both individual and social. In his eyes, progressive nonviolence could express itself best through service, self-suffering and, if necessary, total sacrifice. His mind was always open, fresh and receptive to truth as he went on finding it from day to day by experience. For him, while his own consciousness was the laboratory for searching out the inner core of truth, human society was the field for social experiments which could lead to harmony and happiness. In whatever corner of the world he worked for the time being, the whole of humanity and its good were always present to him.

One very important aspect of his life adds immense significance to what he thought and did. He lived day in and day out open to public view, as on a stage. He took the people and even his opponents into confidence not only in regard to his actions but even his motivations. The result is that none in history has left behind so much of documentation and direct evidence concerning everything he thought and did. Moreover, he himself has written so much and on every conceivable subject that his writings are likely to run into fifty or sixty sumptuous volumes of five hundred pages each. All this material is proving very helpful in assessing Gandhi's relevance both for the present and for the future.

It is impossible in a few brief pages to cover all the aspects of Gandhi's life and teaching which are of relevance to our own times and environment. Here I shall merely draw the attention of the reader to three aspects of his life which are of the utmost importance.

The life-story of Gandhi as a man is of the greatest relevance to every human being who aspires to rise above the average level and lead a meaningful life, with the watchword, "From good to better daily self-surpassed". Gandhi was not merely a moralist but one who believed that man has a great future and that he is evolving towards a higher and nobler destiny. He knew the power of the many vital and sensual urges of man. He has also confessed with remarkable frankness his own weakness in this matter. But what makes a study of his life most helpful is the unceasing attempt he makes to conquer these weaknesses and establish the superiority of moral and spiritual endeavour. Not one of us is free from the weaknesses our minds are subject to. At the same time, every one of us wishes to rise above the excessive demands of the flesh. This constant struggle goes on within us and we require not only inspiration and strength to win this inner battle but also some practical guidance to overcome our weaknesses. Gandhi is eminently fitted to be a good guide to us because he is extremely human and does not interpose any distance between himself and us by assuming an air of superiority or authority. He declared that what he had done, or was doing, every other human being was equally capable of doing. That self-control is the key to the higher and happier life was his constant refrain. His progress in this matter was not by a sudden conversion, or through the grace of some saint or seer or holy shrine. From an erring, faltering, stumbling and struggling youth Gandhi rose to the eminence of being called "a moral genius" by no less a person than the celebrated British philosopher, C.E.M. Joad. This eminence he attained not by accident or luck or good fortune but by a determined and steady effort at self-discipline. His outer life and actions were but the reflection of this inner struggle to hold fast to truth, to truthful living, and to achieve good ends only through good, virtuous, nonviolent means. We can easily see what great importance he attached to self-control and personal virtue if we remember that he felt it necessary to take the vow of continence on the eve of launching the great campaign of satyagraha in South Africa. If one wishes to study a modern life, as in a film, a life which chastened itself from step to step and ultimately became the powerful force that raised a nation from utter slavery to dignified independence, one would have to go to Gandhi. There is something very intimate and personal, something very familiar and near in Gandhi's life because it is so open and sincere. Not only his celebrated autobiography, but his enormous and multitudinous correspondence and even the editorial columns of the journals which he edited for years and in which he always wrote in the first person, all of these reflect the process of his development from time to time. His every word, spoken or written, is like a link in the dialogue between his ego and his higher self. It exposes to view the springs of his motivation and action and thus renders the greatest service to man evolving from the stage of animality to humanity, from untruth to truth, from darkness to light, from hatred to love, from selfishness to altruism, from man the beast to man the god, which is really what all men aspire to be.

What other life can be so relevant and helpful to all of us?

As one reads about the inner life of Gandhi one finds that his had been a heroic struggle against what he thought was mean, low and below the human level. His endeavour was to rise above the life of the senses and to live the life of the spirit. That is why Tolstoy's *The Kingdom of Heaven is Within You* appealed to him so immensely. He laid the greatest store by self-purification. The evil outside was, in his eyes, the reflection of the evil and weakness inside oneself. The inner and the outer world were but the obverse and reverse of the same coin, namely, our existence, our being. If the evil inside was to be fought and conquered, it was equally necessary for man to fight all evil outside with as much determination and bravery. While he was a saint and a holy man in aspiring to be clean and pure, above all the temptations of the flesh and beyond any selfish motivation, and a true devotee of God or Truth, he was nevertheless a saint in constant action, an activist of the highest order. He was not satisfied with his own individual salvation. Like the compassionate Buddha, he was inspired by the passion for relieving every kind of suffering and for wiping out the last tear from the eyes of the last man. That is why his most favourite song and refrain was, "He alone is a true devotee of God who understands the pain and suffering of others". His tireless striving to remove the sources of every kind of suffering arose out of this extreme sensitiveness to the pain of sentient beings, of course, including man.

The other equally important and powerful urge which caught hold of Gandhi's whole being early in life was "to return good for evil". He quotes in his autobiography a stray line from a Gujarati poet which he read in his boyhood. But to act according to this principle became a passion with him throughout his life.

Thus this triple passion—to search in a scientific spirit for the law of individual and social well-being and progress, to establish the truth of that law through love and nonviolence, and always to return good for evil—dominated his life from beginning to end.

If Gandhi's life, thought and action are extremely relevant and useful for every human being who is self-conscious and who aspires after a higher, nobler and more exalted life than he may be living today, Gandhi's teaching as regards social life and its proper organisation is equally positive, constructive and practical. In fact, he called himself a practical idealist. He did not even for a moment forget that man is essentially a social being. Man's relationship to sentient beings and man's relationship to material things may be said to be the subjects of his incessant research during a long, eventful and multifaceted life. While the fundamental lines of his research, namely, the truth about the law of being and its search through love alone, were once for all decided, his mind was always open like that of a scientist to new discoveries. That is why we find so much freshness in the way he deals with ever new situations. Going along the path he had chalked out for himself, he arrived at a social philosophy which could be characterised as a synthesis between the needs, urges and aspirations of the individual and of the society of which the individual is an inseparable and indivisible part. He called it sarvodaya—the rise and well-being of all. While it is the duty and responsibility of society to plan for the fullest possible development of the best in every individual, it is equally necessary that the individual render back unto society what he, in fact, owes to society. Thus there has to be a balancing of rights and obligations between the individuals and the society which they compose. A society will be but an abstract concept if we do not think in terms of the individuals who form it. An individual is equally an abstract entity without a society to live in. Gandhi therefore gave the greatest importance to the flowering of the individual in a properly ordered society, and not merely to organisation and systems. A chain is only as strong as its weakest link and a system is good and efficient only to the extent of the goodness and efficiency of the individuals working it. Gandhi applied these principles to all human organisations and systems, economic, political and social.

Man, the individual, is the centre of Gandhi's system of thought. The objective is the moral and spiritual development of man. Man is primarily his consciousness, his capacity to be self-conscious, and his built-in potentiality to judge between good and evil, between what will help him in his evolution to higher levels of being and what will obstruct his path. This gives him a leverage, not only to aspire after higher levels but to endeavour to attain the same. Gandhi believed in this self-effort and the path he outlined lay through ethical, moral and spiritual disciplines. The key-note of his ethics is love, which means near-identity of interest with every sentient being; this love has to be expressed in the form of service and sacrifice. His ethics in relation to material things and property consisted in his concept of trusteeship. Every human being is a trustee not only of his faculties and attainments but of everything he comes by. And trusteeship consists not only in using his powers and goods properly but in using them selflessly and for the well-being of all others.

As indicated above, his social philosophy boils down to sarvodaya, which precludes the suppression or elimination of any class. But the question is how to bring about this millenium? The satyagraha way of life is his reply. Insistence on the truth of one's own experience through nonviolence alone, even unto death, is the royal road he points out.

Gandhi saw that there was enough of truth, evil, injustice and exploitation in human relationships and public affairs. He was determined that all that must go. He wanted to devise ways and means which would be consistent with the principles he had laid down for himself as being the best. He was as heroic in fighting the evil and injustice in the world outside as in conquering the evil and weakness in his own mind. The means he adopted satisfied the double demand, namely, that they should be truthful and that they should be pure, moral and constructive. Thus, in a world where science and technology have put into the hands of those in possession of wealth, power and authority weapons of coercion and destruction beyond ordinary conception, Gandhi's weapon of satyagraha is a boon. It can be used even by a single individual who has developed sufficient moral power by his own purity of thought and conduct.

The relevance of satyagraha, both as a way of life and as a weapon for evolutionary social change, need not now be in doubt when it was is being used successfully by the Negroes in U.S.A. under the able guidance of Dr Martin Luther King. Though its use in an international conflict has yet to be tried, one can hazard the statement that non-alignment, moral pressure by non-aligned powers, and the economic and other sanctions which the U.N.O. often thinks of are along the line of nonviolent resistance to evil and injustice. It may be said that Aldous Huxley, in his famous book *Ends and Means*, has made a very good case for nonviolent resistance by all those who suffer at the hands of modern governments which are armed to the teeth with the modern instruments of coercion, suppression and destruction. He says that that is the only remedy—and a very civilized moral remedy at that.

The third aspect of Gandhi's teachings which can be taken note of here is his insistence on the resolution of all conflicts by peaceful means. He declared that war and violence never solve any problems. They create new ones and sow the seeds of future wars and the continuance of hatred. The appearance of nuclear weapons, the use of which involves total destruction, has made Gandhi's plea doubly forceful and important if the future of humanity and its peaceful, orderly progress is our concern. The only way is to cease to war against each other and instead, use all our resources to war against the common enemies of man, namely, ignorance, poverty, disease and so on. We must devise means and provide ways to resolve conflicts through negotiation, mediation, arbitration and tribunals—in fact, by every other means than the use of weapons which necessarily involves the destruction of life and property. It does not need any argument to prove that this teaching of Gandhi is relevant so long as conflicts are sought to be resolved through the use of destructive weapons and missiles.

X

Last

It is clear that Gandhi's life, thought, teaching and action are ever relevant for all aspirants of the ethical and spiritual life. His principles and technique of satyagraha are highly efficacious instruments of peaceful economic, social and political change whenever and wherever it is required. His gospel of peaceful means for resolving all conflicts is the only way to escape the disaster of nuclear war. In its totality, Gandhi's teaching is a highly inspiring one and serves as a signpost to humanity marching towards a better, happier and more harmonious world.

Jesus christ says:
"Blessed are the peace-makers
for they shall be called the
children of God."
Gandhi is one of those

SECTION ONE

THE TRADITION OF NONVIOLENCE AND ITS UNDERLYING FORCES

William Stuart Nelson

Between 2000 and 1000 B.C., when the Greeks were still nomads, the oldest religious writings in history appeared in India. They were the Vedas in which we find, what has been described as "the first outpourings of the human mind, the glow of poetry, the rapture of nature's loveliness and mystery".[1] Following the Vedas came the ritualistic Brahmanas, the Laws of Manu, and the philosophical Upanisads. Then appeared the two great popular epics, the *Mahabharata* and the *Ramayana*, and, as a part of the former, the *Bhagavad-Gita*, called by Wilhelm von Humboldt "the most beautiful, perhaps the only true philosophical song existing in any known language".[2]

From the beginning, amidst prayers, philosophical speculation, commandments, poetry and epics the idea of nonviolence was present. In the *Bhagavad-Gita*, ahimsa or nonviolence is a superior ethical virtue:

I foresee no good will come
From killing my own kindred in war.
Even though they slay me, I wish not to strike them.
How can we be happy, having slain our own kindred
Though they, with hearts deadened with avarice,
See not the evil that will come.[3]

The Laws of Manu prescribe that he who would teach others for their well-being must be guided by ahimsa and use sweet and gentle speech towards them. From the *Mahabharata* comes the maxim that nonviolence is the greatest religion or duty.

Not only is nonviolence one of Hinduism's cardinal virtues and its cosmic outlook generally, there are also present in it those other qualities of the human spirit which are inseparable from nonviolence. So in the *Mahabharata* abstention from injury to all creatures in thought, word and deed is admonished and kindness and generosity are called the permanent duties of the good. Enjoin the Laws of Manu: "Let him patiently hear hard words. Let him not insult anybody. Against an angry man let him not in return show anger. Let him bless when he is cursed."[4]

Throughout these thousands of years of scripture we find self-imposed suffering and the surrender of one's possessions to God, both of which we shall discover to be the invariable accompaniments of genuine nonviolence.

Ancient Hinduism followed the course of most religions and leaving behind its pristine years of pure worship, poetry, philosophic and ethical insight deteriorated into an inflexible cultus, other worldliness, and an hierarchical social order rigid in the extreme.

The great reform came with Gautama Buddha, five hundred years before Christ, who gave the world an early and extraordinarily great personal example of total commitment to the nonviolent way of life.

Breaking away from the ritualism of the Vedic religion he attacked the superstitions, ceremonials and priestcraft of popular religion and the related vested interests, metaphysics and theology, miracles and revelations, and everything related to the supernatural. He appealed to reason and experience. He emphasized ethics. Having thus described the Buddhist reformation, Nehru says of Buddha himself: "His whole approach comes like a breath of the fresh wind from the mountains after the stale air of metaphysical speculation".[5]

What of value accrues from violence? The answer of Buddhism is, ". . . hatreds are not quenched by hatred. Nay rather . . . hatreds are quenched by love".[6] And victory can always be relied upon to breed hatred, for the conquered are naturally unhappy.

The speech of men must be under the same rule, for to use harsh language to those who have committed a sin is to strew salt upon the wound of the error.

Buddha taught:

> A brother ought not intentionally
> to destroy the life of any being.[7]
> Not for our life would we ever intentionally
> kill a living being.[8]
> A truth-finder laying aside cudgel and sword,
> lives a life of innocence and mercy. . . .
> He heals divisions and cements friendship; . . .
> for in peace is his delight. . . .[9]

I have spoken of the total commitment of Buddha to the nonviolent way of life. Such a commitment must include a profound concern for the welfare of all. This indeed was a passion with Buddha. He preached to his disciples: "Go unto all lands and preach this gospel. Tell them that the poor and the lowly, the rich and the high, are all one, and that all castes unite in this religion as do the rivers of the sea."[10]

> Live on,
> for the good and the happiness of the great multitudes,
> Out of pity for the world,
> for the good and the gain and the weal of men.[11]

For Buddha, the outcasts were not of the traditional sort. He said:

> The man who is angry and bears hatred,
> who harms living beings, who speaks falsely,
> who exalts himself and despises others—
> let one know him as an outcast.[12]

The commitment to nonviolence involves also self-discipline and self-renunciation. Buddha rejected extreme asceticism and chose rather the Middle Path between self-indulgence and self-mortification coupled with rigid self-discipline. "Not even a God", he said, ". . . could change into defeat the victory of a man who has vanquished himself and always lives under restraint".[13]

Having gained sixty disciples, he sent them on their way, with this message: "Go ye now out of compassion for the world, for the welfare of gods and men. Let not two of you go the same way. Preach the doctrine which is glorious. Proclaim a consummate, perfect and pure life of holiness."[14]

If Buddha did not urge self-mortification, he did warn against the penalty of selfishness. He taught: "People grieve from selfishness; perpetual cares kill them";[15] and

The man who is possessed of much property
Who has gold and food,
And still enjoys his sweet things—
This is the cause of loss.[16]

Later Buddhism in many ways has been apostate to the teachings of its founder and yet, departing from India after more than a thousand years, it has left an ineffaceable mark upon the life and thought of this country.

In India when men speak of the two or three supremely great figures of their past, King Asoka is always among them. He was called the Beloved of the Gods and his reign an Indian historian describes as "one of the brightest interludes in the troubled history of mankind".[17]

Asoka, model of gentleness, succeeded to his father's throne in 268 B.C. at the time the Romans were reviving the Etruscan sport of setting slaves to fight each other for their lives and only a few years before the first gladiatorial games were held in that city. His kingdom was vast, including all of present India except the most southern portion and great territories further north. He was a conquerer until his conversion. Of this conversion Asoka himself tells us. Grieved by the suffering born of one of his great victories, involving the deportation of 150,000 persons, the killing of 100,000 and the death of many times that number, he resolved upon forgiveness and conciliation wherever possible and enjoined his ancestors not to seek new victories and, should they become engaged in conquest by arms, to take pleasure in patience and gentleness and to regard the only true conquest as that won by piety. Although he did not renounce every use of force he undertook no war volutnarily, which led to the great weakening of his kingdom.

The conversion of Asoka was a conversion from the law of conquest to the Law of Piety. What then was the Law of Piety? It was the law of good deeds, compassion, liberality, truthfulness and purity. And so throughout his vast kingdom he ordered the planting of banyan trees to provide shade for both men and beasts, the digging of wells, the providing of watering places, and the erecting of rest houses. He did not see fit to eliminate the death sentence but he ordered the novel rule—novel then and in some places novel now—that the condemned should have three days in which their relatives might come and meditate with them. Animals were not forgotten. Hospitals were erected for them, animal sacrifice was forbidden and restrictions were placed upon the slaughter of animals for food, thereby giving impetus to the practice of vegetarianism. Hunting was abolished. Asoka had no expressed faith in God and little enthusiasm for ceremonials. He complained at the trivial, worthless ceremonies performed by women at weddings, the birth of children, and upon departures on journeys and declared that it is the ceremonial of piety that bears great fruit. This ceremonial, he said, includes the proper treatment of slaves and servants, honour to teachers, gentleness towards living creatures, and liberality towards ascetics and brahmans.

It is to be recalled that Asoka was Buddhist and it is said that his missionaries went from his court as far west as Alexandria. But he was tolerant. Speaking of reverence he said: ". . . the root of it is restraint in speech, to wit, a man must not do reverence to his own sect or disparage that of another man without reason . . . because the sects of other people all deserve reverence for one reason or another. . . . By acting contrariwise, a man hurts his own sect and does disservice to the sects of other people."[18]

This was King Asoka of the third century B.C. Of him H.G. Wells wrote: "For eight and twenty years Asoka worked sanely for the real needs of men. Amidst the tens of thousands of names of monarchs that crowd the columns of history . . . the name of Asoka shines and shines almost alone, a star. From the Volga to Japan his name is still honoured. China, Tibet and even India, though it has left his doctrine, preserve the tradition of his greatness. More men cherish his memory today than have ever heard the names of Constantine or Charlemagne."[19]

It will be profitable in discussing Jainism to recall that Mahavira, its founder, was a contemporary of Buddha, that Jainism and Buddhism developed side by side in sixth century India, B.C., and that they bore important similarities. As was true with Buddhism, Jainism also broke away from the Vedic religion. Neither is concerned with first cause and in both the emphasis is strongly ethical rather than transcendental.

The departure of Jainism from Buddhism in practice was in part largely a matter of degree. Self-discipline in Jainism was carried to a great extreme. Gandhi's early years were spent in Gujarat, Western India, where Jainism was very strong and he and his family fell heavily under its influence.

Described as perhaps the finest ethical feature of Jainism is the year-end penance in which Jains, including both monks and laymen, "are expected to confess their sins, pay their debts, and ask forgiveness of their neighbours for any offences, whether intentional or unintentional".[20]

As in Buddhism, Jainism reveals a strong social concern, the difference being largely in the motivation. In Buddhism, escape from the round of suffering was at least the original motive. Charity in Jainism is good for the soul which is enabled to break the bonds of matter. Thus, often, it is not for love of others but for the love of one's own soul that good works should be performed. Later Jainism revealed a greater warmth and humanity.

As to certain more easily identifiable aspects of nonviolence, Jainism was of all religions in India their most fervent exponent. We read :

> All beings hate pains.
> Therefore one should not kill them.
> This is the quintessence of wisdom,
> not to kill anything.[21]

This doctrine has led to the most extraordinary practices, including the sweeping of paths as one walks along and the wearing of gauze over one's mouth to avoid the accidental killing of any creature. Moreover, in the Jain view, a good rebirth or salvation cannot be achieved in violence against earth or water, for many souls are embodied in water and many creatures live in the earth.

Although ahimsa was emphasized as the greatest virtue in personal relations, warfare for Jains, as for most Indians, was legitimate and militarism was not strongly opposed. Practical astuteness in Jain thinking is revealed in the following observation: "The force of arms cannot do what peace does. If you can gain your desired end with sugar, why use poison?"[22]

□

The Sermon on the Mount, said Gandhi, "went straight to my heart",[23] and he records his delight in the verses which begin: "But I say unto you, that ye resist not evil: but whosoever smite thee on thy right cheek turn to him the other also."[24] Gandhi was not concerned with the exegesis of what he read, with amassing supporting scriptural passages, or with the defence of his interpretation against a contrary one. What he read went straight to his heart and that was sufficient. The reasons for this is clear. What he read confirmed his own deepest insights.

The believer in nonviolence, however, will find numerous defences of the interpretation of Jesus as a prophet of the non-violent life. If the episode of Jesus casting the money-changers out of the temple with a "scourge of cords" has troubled him he will learn that the verb used for "driving out" or "casting out" is the same as that employed to describe sending away a cured leper and sending forth workers to the harvest. He will find support in one scholar who writes that the essence of what Jesus taught is distilled in the "Golden Rule", and crystallized in the two great commandments of "complete love of God, and unfailing love of one's neighbour. His blessing is for the peacemakers. He holds it to be nearer his own spirit to suffer than to inflict it, even when the suffering is undeserved. Instead of seeking revenge, he calls on his disciples to love their enemies and pray for those who persecute them. . . . Finally his acceptance of the Cross was a summary in action of all that he had taught in word."[25]

A second New Testament scholar adds that "the ethical teaching of Jesus, according to any natural and straightforward exegesis, is obviously and flagrantly incompatible with intentional and organized bloodshed and therefore with war".[26]

The lives and convictions of the early Christians also afford convincing if not conclusive evidence that the intrinsic nature of the life and teachings of Jesus is persuasive testimony against violence and participation in violence. For more than two centuries Christians were preponderantly opposed to war, refusing to justify and to participate in it.

A church order as late as the third century required soldiers to abandon the calling of soldiering before baptism and provided for the excommunication of Christians who joined the army. About 150 years after Christ, Marcus Aurelius Antonius, pressed by the enemy, entreated Christians to join his forces and then threatened them only to be met by refusal "for the Cause and Names of their God, which they bear in their Consciences".[27] The answer of Martin to Julian the Apostate, 300 years after Christ, was, "I am a Soldier of Christ, therefore I cannot fight".[28]

Then followed the great tragedy—the wedding of the Christian Church to Rome. Says Cadoux of the great change: "Allowing for a little exaggeration, (it) is broadly speaking true" that "the Church as a whole definitely gave up her anti-military leanings, abandoned all her scruples, finally adopted the imperial point of view and treated the ethical problem involved as a closed question".[29]

At the time of the Protestant Reformation we see repeated a familiar historical pattern: revolt against long-established religious authority and practices accompanied by a vigorous assertion or reassertion of the nonviolent temper. Thus came John Hus and the Moravians, the Mennonites and the Schwenkfelders, and later George Fox and the Quakers.

The Quakers are well known to us and they are known not only for their consistent testimony against war but for their commitment to a total way of life which is the invariable accompaniment of genuine nonviolence. Whatever deviation from the nonviolent way there may have been among individual Quakers, the record testifies that "no regularly constituted body of the Society of Friends has ever made a declaration contrary to the strict pacifist position".[30]

When Howard Brinton[31] describes the method of nonviolence in his Society, he includes the Quaker testimony and action against the horrors of seventeenth-century prison life which subjected these protesting Christians themselves to cruel suffering, for their pains. He described the long and painful effort of Quakers to have substituted for the inhumane treatment of the insane the ways of sympathy and kindness. He quotes the admonition of George Fox to "Let your Light shine among Indians, the Blacks and the Whites that ye may answer the truth in them"[32]. He records the program of Quaker relief of the distressed which began in 1690 during the Irish war when Quakers supplied war prisoners with food and clothing and which continues until this moment in the far and near places of the earth. And of course he describes the quiet, brave, novel and often fruitful labours of Quakers in the interest of international peace.

□

Gandhi expresses himself as being overwhelmed upon reading Leo Tolstoy's *The Kingdom of God is Within You* and he called himself Tolstoy's humble follower. What did Gandhi find in this and others of Tolstoy's writing? He found, for one thing, that in Tolstoy's view a Christian is one who eschews violence, even avoids disputes with his neighbour and thus gains freedom for himself and helps to free the world. To the question as to whether those who resist nonviolently will be killed, Tolstoy answered, yes, but in numbers only a fraction of those who die in revolutionary wars.

In common with others who professed nonviolence Tolstoy was deeply offended by a religion of ecclesiasticism, of dogmas, of sacraments, fasts and prayers. Religion, he held, gave meaning to life, but the Church was an insult to his reason. "A life based on Christian truth was precious and indispensable to me, and the Church offered me rules completely at variance with the truth I loved."[33] He did believe in God. "I believe in God", he confessed, "whom I understand as Spirit, as love, as the Source of all. I believe that He is in me and I in Him. I believe that the will of God is most clearly and intelligently expressed in the teaching of the man Jesus whom to consider God and to pray to, I consider the greatest blasphemy."[34] He also believed in faith, but a faith reconciled with reason. The result of Tolstoy's stricture against the Church was his excommunication. Tolstoy's was the first public funeral held in Russia without religious rites.

Protesting against mysticism and revelation of any type, Tolstoy expressed his profound faith in morality. "Religion", he said, "is a certain relation established by man between his separate personality and the infinite universe of its Source. And morality is the ever-present guide to life which results from that relation."[35]

Tolstoy's nature was volcanic. Caught at the age of fifty-seven between the message of Christ and man's ways, he forsook the life of privilege, went barefoot, adopted plain attire, worked the fields at the side of peasants, forsook smoking, meat-eating, and hunting.

In Tolstoy the spirit of nonviolence found another logical expression, for he suffered with the suffering poor and strove with all his mighty energies to bring them relief. He petitioned the government to grant peasants an equal share with others, to forbid the disregard of Common Law, to remove all barriers to education, and remove all limitations on religious liberty. "A good deed", he said, "does not consist merely of feeding the hungry with bread, but of loving both the hungry and the satisfied. For it is more important to love than to feed, because one may feed and not love, but it is impossible to love and not to feed."[36] Shortly, however, his diary carried the note: "I hardly slept all night. In the morning I said that this feeding the hungry is a serious matter."[37] The record shows that he plunged vigorously into the feeding of the famine sufferers.

It is obvious why Gandhi so willingly became Tolstoy's disciple and it is society's great fortune that Tolstoy found one who would bring to such magnificent flowering the seed he had sown.

□

United States Representative William H. Meyer of Vermont has opposed the draft of men into the armed services and expressed the non-conforming belief that Communist China should be a member of the United Nations. Apropos of this a columnist of the *Washington Post* has commented that such obedience to conscience is in the tradition of Thoreau who went to jail for his belief in the abolition of slavery.[38]

In the first paragraph of his celebrated paper on "Civil Disobedience", Thoreau protested against the United States' war against Mexico.[39] His more vigorous protest was the refusal to pay a tax in support of that war. He was thus seized and placed in jail. The story is told that Emerson visited Thoreau in his new quarters and inquired as to why he was there. The answer Thoreau is said to have given was, "Waldo, why are you not here?" As to Thoreau, Emerson was led to remark eloquently, "On him they could not calculate".[40]

In Thoreau we hear a familiar note. He was repelled by organized religion, "signed off" from the village church and refused to pay his tax for the support of the minister. He once lectured in an Amherst, New Hampshire, Orthodox church and later expressed the hope that thereby he had helped to undermine it. He had no creed, we are told, yet he himself said: "Happy the man who . . . lives a balanced life, acceptable to nature and to God."[41] And Bronson Alcott, who knew him well, observed: "I should say he inspired love, if indeed the sentiment he awakens did not seem to partake of something yet purer, if that were possible, and as yet nameless from its rarity and excellence."[42]

In American history Thoreau's two years' sojourn alone in a cabin outside of Concord by Walden Pond is famous not that many understand fully Thoreau's "clear-sighted view of a false economics and the perversion of values in American living". Only now has the full significance of Walden been felt, says Henry Seidel Canby. For, he continues, "It is only in our generation that the industrial revolution has reached a point where man is in real danger of becoming a machine thinking like a machine. . . . And it is only in our own time that bodily comfort and the satisfactions of pride have been elevated into what is frankly called the American standard of living."[43]

Thoreau bore one further mark of the nonviolent spirit. His heart bled at the sight of injustice and all human suffering. His house was a station on the underground railroad and he himself escorted a fugitive slave enroute to Canada. The death of John Brown stirred him to the depths of his being. Speaking to a Concord audience on this man recently hanged, he said, "For once we are lifted out of the trivialness and dust of politics into the region of truth and manhood"[44]; and "the only government that I recognize . . . is that power that establishes justice in the land, never that which establishes injustice."[45]

Thoreau was not a pacifist. For him passive resistance was not enough where wrong was rampant. "I do not wish to kill or be killed", he said, "but I foresee, circumstances in which both of these things would be by me unavoidable. In extremities I could even be killed." And yet he would not kill a bird despite his scientific interests or even hold it in his hands. ". . . I would rather hold it in my affections", he said.[46]

Gandhi first read Thoreau's *Civil Disobedience* in prison. In reflecting upon this prison experience Gandhi quotes from Thoreau: "I say that if there was a wall of stone between me and my townsmen, there was a still more difficult one to climb or break through before they could get to be as free as I was. I did not feel for a moment confined, and the walls seemed a great waste of stone and mortar."[47] Upon reading Thoreau's *Civil Disobedience* Gandhi began to call his movement Civil Disobedience for English readers, instead of passive resistance. Later he adopted the phrase Civil Resistance.

□

I hope that in this cursory, fragmentary survey of the nonviolent tradition certain unmistakable signs of the meaning and the underlying principles or forces of nonviolence have appeared. These forces I wish now to summarize and to examine in relation especially to the Gandhian philosophy of nonviolence.

First, *the origin and support of the spirit of nonviolence in a people or a person has no single explanation.* It may be given, that is, born of the culture of one's religious heritage, at the mother's knee. Gandhi's nonviolence was in gestation for three thousand years, at the least, here in the land of Hinduism, Buddhism and Jainism. Kaba Gandhi, his father, was a man who knew his mind and stood by it. His mother could "take the hardest vows" without flinching.

Again nonviolence is sometimes born of an extremity, of one's own suffering or the sufferings of others. King Asoka could not bear the horror on the battle field of Kalinga and he was reborn. Gandhi could not bear the insults inflicted upon himself and upon his fellow darkskinned people in South Africa and he began the search for an answer. This search ended in a religion of truth and nonviolence.

Whatever the origin of nonviolence it must be supported by reason. The Buddhist saw clearly that victory by force breeds hatred, for the conquered is always unhappy. Gandhi was inspired by the great tradition of ahimsa in India but he spent a lifetime elaborating a rational structure for his faith, in which he reasoned: self-sacrifice is superior to the sacrifice of others; if the cause is not right then only the resisters will suffer; nonviolence is the aseptic way of permitting the poison to work itself out by letting all the natural forces have full play; nonviolence arouses the best in others; apparent good from violence is temporary, while the evil is permanent; good brought through force destroys individuality, while nonviolent non-cooperation preserves individuality.

Christian pacifists call upon the New Testament for support but they have reasons of their own. Quakers, for example, invoke the example of Christ but they also justify nonviolence as answering "that of God" in other men; in fighting, they explain, one side or the other loses while in the nonviolent way there is the possibility that both sides may win; they point out that force can produce a superficial unity such as exists in a machine but not organic unity born of an appeal to the "Light" within.

Tolstoy reasoned that life lost through nonviolent resistance can be only a fraction of that lost in violent revolutions.

Manifestly the nonviolent spirit may be born in and, in some respects, nurtured by the workings of all these forces: one's heritage, one's extremity, one's reason. But nonviolence lives and grows also by experimentation. Gandhi's life was an experiment with truth and the means to truth, nonviolence. His life, he said, consisted of nothing more than these experiments.

In a sense he was a scientist, claiming no finality concerning his conclusions, accepting here and rejecting there, seeking always, as he said, to satisfy his reason and his heart.

Second, *nonviolence is not a single virtue or a single quality of life; it is a congeries of virtues, of qualities; it is a spirit, a way of life, a religion,* or as Gandhi would say, the law of one's being. In Gandhi's structure, there are two basic pillars, truth and ahimsa or nonviolence or, as he also called it, love. Truth is the end; nonviolence is the means. But the end and the means are bound irrevocably to each other, for a vision of truth is dependent upon the realization of nonviolence. As truth is God, so also love is God. Love surely is not a single virtue; it is a way of life, it is a religion. His life he considered as one indivisible whole. "What", he asks, "was the larger 'symbiosis' that Buddha and Christ preached? Gentleness and love."[48]

Let us look, then, at those qualities of life which comprise the symbiosis which Gandhi called nonviolence. True nonviolence is religion, for it is a total commitment to that which the individual regards as supreme in the world. In Gandhi, however, and in every authentic example of nonviolence there s a suspicion of and often a revolt against other-worldliness, excessive ritualism, insistence upon theology, and ecclesiasticism. Gandhi, however, was wise. Although he considered himself a true reformer he never permitted his zeal to lead him to the rejection of anything in Hinduism which he considered essential. Nowhere, indeed, was his genius more apparent than in the synthesis he achieved between the history, the language, and certain forms of his religious heritage on the one hand and a radical reinterpretation of religion on the other.

For Gandhi the essence of religion is morality. "I reject any religious doctrine that does not appeal to reason and is in conflict with morality."[49] Unreasonable religious sentiment he could tolerate but not when it was immoral. In his philosophy "there is no such thing as religion overriding morality".[50]

For Gandhi the golden rule of conduct, the conduct called nonviolence, was mutual toleration, for he realized that all men will never think as one and that truth will always appear in fragments.

For him all religions are true, all religions contain some error, all religions were almost as dear to him as his own Hinduism. His prayer for another was ". . . *not* 'God, give him the light that Thou hast given me', *but* 'Give him all the light and truth he needs for his highest development' ".[51]

This did not mean an abandonment of what he believed and held dear. He said he would let the winds of doctrine blow through the windows and doors of his house but he would refuse to be swept off his feet. His own religion he would not abandon but he would do what he could to improve and purify it.

For Gandhi nonviolence is inconceivable without self-renunciation. "I must reduce myself to zero", he said, for "ahimsa is the farthest limit of humanity".[52] In things material he did reduce himself to all but zero. Wherever I walked or talked with him, morning, afternoon, or evening, in a remote village or a great city, it was always the same—nothing of dress, of furniture, of house, of livery of any sort to distract. There was no hurry. When he walked into a woman's home and saw the miserable inadequacy of what she wore, he immediately reduced his own dress next to zero and continued to do this until he died.

Gandhi knew too well that men who are burdened with possessions they love are never really free. He warned, however, that renunciation of desire is far more important than the renunciation of objects. In abstention as in all other matters he emphasized that the spirit was the matter. "A man", he says, "over-scrupulous in diet is an utter stranger to ahimsa and a pitiful wretch if he is a slave to selfishness and passions and is hard of heart".

Nonviolence is compassion. At midnight on 15 August 1947 I listened to Mr Nehru as he spoke on the transfer of power that was then taking place from the British Government to India. He referred to Gandhi, who was absent, as one who if he could would wipe every tear from every eye. Nowhere in our time, perhaps even for a thousand years, have men known one with greater compassion for his fellowmen. When he could not give them the clothes they needed he reduced his own to the barest minimum. When the removal of untouchable slums was beyond his power, he made his home in one. He dedicated his life to the breaking of the chains that bound his people. He died a martyr because he dared to fight the cause of a people called enemies by some of his own community. The innocent child and the convict, the harmless beggar at his door and his alien oppressor, all alike were the objects of his compassion.

This was a compassion, moreover, that found expression in a great constructive program designed to free the body and lift the spirit—a program of spinning and other crafts, of village organization, of education. For him the spinning wheel became the symbol *par excellence* of nonviolence. It united the people peacefully and in common trust. It promised relief from degrading poverty.

Finally, nonviolence is a weapon of the strong. My final conversation with Gandhi was in Calcutta in August of 1947 when riots raged between Hindus and Muslims, the Hindus, now in authority, being the aggressors. I raised a question of the efficacy of the nonviolent technique in group relations. He declared that on that subject he was at the moment in darkness. He had spent almost a lifetime teaching that nonviolence was a weapon not of the weak but of the strong, of those who are able to strike back but will not. He realized then that his people did not understand. This is one of the most difficult aspects of nonviolence to fathom and accept and the explanation for the failure of so many efforts in its name. Nonviolence is not an expedient to be used when no other instrument is available and one is otherwise powerless. It is not a tactic, a strategy. It is a way of life, a religion. It begins in personal relations, in attitudes towards all men—the strong and the weak; it expresses itself in thought, in speech, as well as in action.

This does not mean that mass nonviolence should never be attempted until every participant has attained perfection. It does require that the ideal be clear, that there be commitment, that men shall be in candidacy for the quality of spirit and life exemplified in Jesus of Nazareth and which so lately was revealed among us in Mohandas K. Gandhi.

---

1. Jawaharlal Nehru. Quoted by H.G. Wells, *Outline of History* (New York,

The Macmillan Company, 1921) p. 252.
2. Quoted by Jawaharlal Nehru, *The Discovery of India* (New York, The John Day Company, 1946) p. 99.
3. *Bhagavad-Gita*, 1.31, 35, 37, 38.
4. Laws of Manu, 6: 47-48.
5. *Op. cit.*, p. 111.
6. *Vinaya*, 1.342-349.
7. *Mahavagga*, 1.78.4 (*Sacred Books of the East*, 13.235).
8. *Mahavagga*, 6.31.13 (*Sacred Books of the East*, 17.117).
9. *Cula-Hatthi-Padopama Sutta* (*Sacred Books of Buddhism*, 5: 128, 129).
10. Quoted by Nehru, *op. cit.*, p. 119.
11. *Maha-Parinibbana Sutta*, 3.4 (*Sacred Books of the East*, 11.41).
12. *Sacred Books of the East*, 10: 2. 21-22.
13. *Ibid.*, 10: 1.31-32.
14. *Ibid.*, 13.112-113.
15. *Sutta Nipata*, 805 (*Sacred Books of the East*, 12.2.150).
16. *Ibid.*, 101 (*Sacred Books of the East*, 10.2.18).
17. Quoted by Narendra Krishna Sinha and Anil Chandra Banerjee, *History of India* (Calcutta, A. Mukherjee and Company, 1947) p. 84.
18. *Rock Edict* XII, Vincent A. Smith, *Asoka* (Delhi, S. Chand and Company, 1957) p. 170.
19. *Outline of History* (New York, The Macmillan Company, 1921) p. 371.
20. A.L. Basham, "Jainism and Buddhism", in *Sources of Indian Tradition* by Bary, Hay, Weiler, and Yarrow (New York, Columbia University Press, 1958), p. 53.
21. *Sutra-Krtanga Sutra*, 1.11.9-10 (*Sacred Books of the East*, 45.311).
22. *Nitivakyamrita*, 344-56, cento. Quoted by Basham, *op. cit.*, p. 90.
23. *Autobiography* (Washington, D.C., Public Affairs Press, 1948) p. 92.
24. *Ibid.*
25. G.H.C. Macgregor, *The New Testament Basis of Pacifism* (London, James Clarke and Company, Ltd., 1938) p. 35.
26. C. J. Cadoux, *The Early Church and the World* (Edinburgh, T. and T. Clark, 1925) p. 55.
27. Robert Barclay, *An Apology for the True Christian Divinity* (Birmingham, John Baskerville, MDCCLXV) p. 495.
28. *Ibid.*
29. Cadoux, *op. cit.*, p. 588.
30. Howard Brinton, *Friends for 300 Years* (New York, Harper and Brothers, 1952) p. 160.
31. *Op. cit.*, p. 151 ff.
32. *Ibid.*
33. Lyof N. Tolstoi, "My Religion", *My Confession, My Religion, The Gospel in Brief* (New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1929) p. 80.
34. Ernest J. Simmons, *Leo Tolstoy* (Boston, Little Brown and Company, 1945) p. 599.

35. *Ibid.*, p. 499.

36. *Ibid.*, p. 467.

37. *Ibid.*

38. Marquis Childs, *The Washington Post and Times Herald*, 17 July 1959.

39. Henry D. Thoreau, "Civil Disobedience", in *Yankee in Canada* (Boston, Houghton, Mifflin and Company, 1885) p. 123.

40. George F. Whicher, *Walden Revisited* (Chicago, Packard and Company, 1945) p. 68.

41. *Ibid.*, p. 64.

42. *Ibid.*, p. 57.

43. Henry Seidel Canby, *Thoreau* (Boston, Houghton, Mifflin and Company, 1939) p. 293.

44. Whicher, *op. cit.*, p. 70.

45. *Ibid.*, p. 71.

46. Canby, *op. cit.*, p. 325.

47. Quoted by Louis Fischer, *The Life of Mahatma Gandhi* (New York, Harper and Brothers, 1950) p. 87.

48. *Young India*, 5 December 1920.

49. *Young India*, 7 July 1920.

50. *Young India*, 24 November 1921.

51. *Sabarmati—1928* (Sabarmati, Federation of International Fellowships, 1928).

52. *Autobiography*, p. 616.

A STUDY OF THE MEANINGS OF NONVIOLENCE

Gene Sharp

"Nonviolence", "nonviolent resistance", "satyagraha" and "pacifism" are words now frequently found in such newspapers as the *Manchester Guardian, The Times,* and the *New York Times.*

The Negroes of Montgomery, Alabama, conduct a year-long nonviolent bus boycott. Danilo Dolci is jailed for leading hungry Sicilians in a nonviolent demonstration. Jehovah's Witnesses continue to gain adherents to their creed, which includes refusal of military duty. The word "pacifism" appears frequently in news reports from Germany.

The crew of the ketch *Golden Rule* go to prison for attempting to stop U.S. nuclear tests by sailing into the Pacific "proving grounds". The Welsh Nationalists use nonviolent resistance in addition to educational and electoral methods in their struggle for Welsh self-government. Young Frenchmen begin their fifth year in prison as war resisters.

London newspapers headline the arrest of 45 opponents of nuclear weapons for civil disobedience in nonviolently "invading" a rocket base site in an effort to halt construction. In India, Vinoba Bhave redistributes land by "looting with love". A Mennonite father refuses to send his children to an Ohio school because they will be taught war-like and un-Godly ideas. Commander Sir Stephen King-Hall lectures to top British naval, army and air-force officers on "The Alternative to the Nuclear Deterrent: Nonviolent Resistance". Women of Budapest stop Russian tanks by lying down in front of them.

Filmstar Don Murray, as a religious pacifist, helps resettle World War II refugees still without homes. South African "Black Sash" women keep silent vigils to defend the Constitution. Hundreds in Britain march four days in rain, snow and sun to the Aldermaston Atomic Weapons Research Establishment in protest against nuclear weapons. The All-African Peoples' Conference in Accra pledges support for nonviolent resistance, including civil disobedience, movements for the liberation of Africa.

Although almost everyone says the world must end war forever or be destroyed, the ideas and ideals of "nonviolence"[1] and methods of nonviolent social action are still espoused by only minorities. But they have now risen to sufficient prominence that they must be reckoned with in world thinking and events. Gandhi is in large degree responsible for this. The impact of "nonviolence", however, is now felt in many parts of the world and arises from diverse sources. This increased awareness of "nonviolence" has come despite (or because of) the fact that many of the ideas, ideals and methods of "nonviolence" run counter to established orthodoxies and socially approved behaviour. They also stand in contrast to modern developments of violence: totalitarianism and nuclear weapons.

Despite this growing awareness of "nonviolence" there is widespread confusion about just what "nonviolence" is. All the above examples and many more have been labelled with the terms "nonviolence" and "pacifism". This lack of clarity has its effect on the groups promoting nonviolent approaches, on criticisms by their opponents, and on the thinking of still others. The usual degree of misunderstanding which may result from a varied and imprecise use of terms becomes plain confusion when the phenomena concerned are relatively little known. When these phenomena include unorthodox ideas, beliefs and methods of resistance—each of which may be associated with strong emotions among both proponents and opponents—the confusion may become chaos.

At first glance, all that is "not violence" may seem to be of a single kind. In a society where such systems of ideas, beliefs and behaviour are usually regarded as esoteric, "crack-pot", impractical, dangerous or simply strange, few people undertake a sufficiently serious examination of these phenomena to make them aware that quite different types of belief and behaviour are involved. "Pacifism", "passive resistance" "nonviolence" and the other terms are commonly used either as broad generalities (glittering, scathing or just vague) or with a wide variety of more specific meanings for the same word. A failure, however, to discern the very real differences among the various types of "nonviolence" and to exercise more care in the use of the terms may have a number of undesirable consequences. Two of these are that evaluation of the merits and demerits of those approaches will be seriously handicapped, and that research in this area will face unnecessary difficulties.

Persons rejecting violence on grounds of principle have rarely analysed the relation of their particular belief systems to others also rejecting violence. They have failed to do this largely because such analysis has seemed to them irrelevant: their duty was to follow the imperatives of their beliefs. However, some of them have recognized differences in motivation and behaviour among those rejecting violence.

For example, Guy F. Hershberger, a Mennonite, distinguishes between "nonresistance" and "modern pacifism". Non-resistance, he says, describes the faith and life of those "who cannot have any part in warfare because they believe the Bible forbids it, and who renounce all coercion, even nonviolent coercion". Pacifism, he says, is "a term which covers many types of opposition to war".[2]

Some Western pacifists[3] have seen Gandhi's approach as sufficiently different from their own that they have felt it was not genuinely "pacifist". Reginald Reynolds writes: "A reading of 'official' [British] pacifist literature from, say, 1920 onwards would reveal some odd things which many pacifists would prefer to forget. People accepted as 'leading pacifists' were, as late as 1930, writing abusive articles about Gandhi and defending British Rule in India. Such articles and letters could be found in *The*

Friend (weekly unofficial paper of the Quakers), in *Reconciliation* (monthly organ of the Fellowship of Reconciliation), and in *No More War* (the monthly organ of the [No More War] movement)."[4]

Western pacifists have sometimes distinguished between the "religious" pacifists and the "nonreligious" pacifists who base their pacifism on "humanitarian" or "philosophical" considerations. This distinction has also been made by non-pacifists.[5] Pacifists have also recongnized differences among themselves in their response to military conscription. There have been: (a) the "absolutists" who believe in civil disobedience to such laws and refuse cooperation with the administrative agencies for military conscription even to obtain their personal exemption from military duty where the law allows for such exemption; (b) those who refuse entry into the armed forces (even as non-combatants) but are willing to cooperate with the conscription system to obtain their exemption from military duty and are willing to perform alternative civilian work where such alternative is allowed; and (c) those who refuse to bear arms but are willing to perform non-combatant (e.g. medical) duties within the armed forces.[6]

Although Gandhi never wrote systematic treatises on "nonviolence", he did distinguish between two or more types of "nonviolence".[7] After first calling his South African protest movements "passive resistance", he discarded the term and adopted a new term, satyagraha.[8] "When in a meeting of Europeans I found that the term 'passive resistance' was too narrowly construed that it was supposed to be a weapon of the weak, that it could be characterized by hatred, and that it could finally manifest itself as violence, I had to demur to all these statements and explain the real nature of the Indian movement. It was clear that a new word must be coined by the Indians to designate their struggle."[9] Gandhi also seems to have assumed an implicit distinction between Western pacifism and satyagraha, although explicit statements to this effect are difficult to find. Bharatan Kumarappa, in an introductory note to a small collection of Gandhi's writings prepared for the World Pacifist Conference in India, December 1949—January 1950, writes: "It is a far cry . . . from pacifism to Gandhiji's idea of nonviolence.

While pacifism hopes to get rid of war chiefly by refusing to fight and by carrying on propaganda against war, Gandhiji goes much deeper and sees that war cannot be avoided, so long as the seeds of it remain in man's breast and grow and develop in his social, political and economic life. Gandhiji's cure is, therefore, very radical and far-reaching. It demands nothing less than rooting out violence from oneself and from one's environment."[10]

The American sociologist Clarence Marsh Case in his study of such phenomena explicity recognises differences between various types,[11] although he makes no attempt to develop a typology. He uses the terms "nonviolent resistance" and "passive resistance" interchangeably.[12]

Political scientist Dr Mulford Sibley has distinguished three types of "nonviolence": Hindu pacifism (satyagraha), Christian pacifism, and revolutionary secular pacifism.[13] This classification, however, did not purport to encompass the field of "nonviolence" and was limited to those modern types of pacifism containing political theory. Professor Leo Kuper of the Sociology Department of Natal University has distinguished between nonviolent resistance movements aimed at achieving their goals by means of embarrassment and conversion of their opponents respectively;[14] but, again, this does not purport to be a full typology.

Theodore Paullin[15] comes close to developing a typology of "nonviolence", although this was not his main intention. Paullin structured his discussion on the basis of six types resulting from a continuum "at one end of which we place violence coupled with hatred, and at the other, dependence only upon the application of positive love and goodwill. In the intermediate positions we might place (1) violence without hatred, (2) nonviolence practised by necessity rather than because of principle, (3) nonviolent coercion, (4) satyagraha and nonviolent direct action, and (5) nonresistance."[16] The nonviolence extremity of his continuum, "active goodwill and reconciliation", becomes the sixth type. Because Paullin's main objective in the booklet was to consider the application of "nonviolent means of achieving group purposes"[17] his classification has suffered through lack of development and refinement. Some types of "nonviolence" have not been included,[18] and some seem classified incorrectly.[19] Paullin has, however, made a genuine contribution towards developing a typology.

Generic Nonviolence

The whole gamut of behaviour and belief characterized by an abstention from physical violence is hereafter described by the term "generic nonviolence". This is the sense in which the term "nonviolence" has been hitherto used in this paper.[20] "Generic nonviolence" thus includes a wide variety of types of "nonviolence": all the examples briefly listed in the opening section of this paper and more. These vary widely on several points, such as whether "nonviolence" is viewed as intrinsically good or simply as an effective method of action, the degree of passivity and activity, the presence or absence of strategy, and whether the followers of the approach are "other worldly" or "this wordly". These phenomena have in common only the abstention from physical violence, either generally or in meeting particular conflict situations, or both. Not included in this broad classification are: (1) hermits and (2) cases of cowardice (both involving a *de facto* withdrawal, though for different reasons, from aspects of life involving physical violence rather than the offering of a nonviolent response in the situation); and (3) legislation, State decrees, etc. (backed by threat of physical violence, as imprisonment, execution, etc.).

Pacifism

The term 'pacifism' as here defined, includes the belief systems of those persons and groups who, as a minimum, refuse participation in all international or civil wars or violent revolutions and base this refusal on moral, ethical or religious principle. Such persons and groups are here called "pacifists". "Pacifism" is thus a narrower term than "generic nonviolence", and is an intermediary classification including several of the types of generic nonviolence described below. These are indicated below after the typology.

Nonviolent Resistance and Direct Action

"Nonviolent resistance and direct action" is another intermediary classification, being both narrower than "generic nonviolence" and broader than the specific types. The methods of "nonviolent resistance and direct action" fall on a continuum between personal exemplary behaviour and verbal persuasion at one end and sabotage and physical violence at the other.

"Nonviolent resistance and direct action" refers to those methods of resistance and direct action without physical violence in which the members of the nonviolent group perform either (1) *acts of omission*—that is, they refuse to perform acts which they usually perform, and are expected by custom to perform *or* are required by law or regulation to perform; or (2) *acts of commission*—that is, they insist on performing acts which they usually do not perform, are not expected by custom to perform *or* are forbidden by law or regulation from performing; or (3) *both*.

These methods are "extra-constitutional": that is, they do not rely upon established procedures of the State (whether parliamentary or non-parliamentary) for achieving their objective. Such acts may be directed towards a change in, or abolition of, existing attitudes, values, social patterns, customs or social structure, or a combination of these. Such change or abolition may take place whether these attitudes etc. are of the society as a whole or of only a section of it. Such acts may also be directed, in defence of attitudes, values, social patterns, customs, or social structure, or a combination of these, against attempts of the opponent to alter or to abolish them, whether by the introduction of particular or general innovations or both.

In some cases of nonviolent resistance and direct action the primary intent is to change attitudes and values as a preliminary to changing policies. In other cases, the primary intent is to change policies (or thwart attempts to change policies) whether or not the opponents have first changed their attitudes and values. In other cases, the intent may be to change simultaneously attitudes and policies. Included in "nonviolent resistance and direct action" are those cases where violence has been rejected because of (1) religious, ethical or moral reasons; (2) considerations of expediency; and (3) mixed motivations of various types. Where the behaviour of the nonviolent group is primarily *resistance*, usually acts of omission, it can be described simply as "nonviolent resistance". Where the behaviour of the nonviolent group is primarily *intervention*, usually acts of commission, it can be described as "nonviolent direct action".[21] The types of generic nonviolence which are included in the category "nonviolent resistance and direct action"[22] are indicated below following the typology.

The Types of Generic Nonviolence

In developing this typology, the writer has sought to observe the "natural" groupings or types as they seem to exist, rather than preselecting certain criteria and then seeking to fit the phenomena into the pre-determined categories. After a classification of the types had been made, the writer sought to examine what were the intrinsic characteristics possessed by the respective types which distinguish them from the others. The criteria which emerged include such factors as whether the motivation for nonviolence is expediency, principle, or mixed; whether the nonviolent group's belief system is "other worldly" or "this worldly": whether or not the nonviolent group has a program of social change; what is the nonviolent group's attitude towards the opponents; whether all or only some physical violence is rejected; whether the nonviolent group is concerned with its own integrity; and others. Following the description of the types of generic nonviolence, appears a chart listing the main criteria which emerged.

The nine types of generic nonviolence described below are: non-resistance, active reconciliation, moral resistance, selective nonviolence, passive resistance, peaceful resistance, nonviolent direct action, satyagraha, and nonviolent revolution.[23] [24] These are listed roughly in the order of increasing activity.[25] *There are no strict separations between some of these types, and particular cases may not seem to fit exactly into any one of them.* This classification should be viewed simply as a *tool* to facilitate understanding and study of the phenomena, a tool which is neither perfect nor final, but may nevertheless be useful.

The examples cited and statements used as illustrations for the respective types have been chosen from those available to the writer on the basis of their adequacy as illustrations and because of the presence of suitable documentation. There is no pretence that the examples cited are geographically representative or exhaustive of the cases belonging to each type. Further research on each of these types could provide abundant additional examples and illustrative statements.

Non-resistance

The non-resistants reject on principle all physical violence, whether on an individual, State or international level. There are various Christian sects of this type, such as the Mennonites and the Amish. They refuse participation in war, and also in the State by holding government office, voting or having recourse to the courts. They pay their taxes, however, and do what the State demands, as long as it is not inconsistent with what they consider to be their duty to God. They refuse to resist evil situations even by nonviolent techniques, and in times of oppression simply hold to their beliefs and follow them—ignoring the evil as much as possible, and suffering their lot as part of their religious duty.

The non-resistants are concerned with being true to their beliefs and maintaining their own integrity, rather than with attempts at social reconstruction, many even opposing attempts to create a good society here on earth. A common belief of the non-resistants is that it is not possible for the world as a whole to become free from sin, and therefore, the Christian should withdraw from evil. Such influence as they have on society results from their acts of goodwill (such as relief work), their exhortations and their example.

The non-resistants have their roots in early Christianity. With very few exceptions, the early Christians refused all military service and subservience to the Roman emperor. The crucial change began under the reign of Constantine, who was converted to Christianity in 312 A.D. and declared it to be the State religion in 324 A.D.[26] After the main Christian groups began to turn towards the State for support and no longer refused participation in war, small heretical groups perpetuated the pacifist interpretation of Christianity. They were cruelly persecuted. Some of their names have been lost.

In the Middle Ages and later there were many sects which sought a return to what they believed to be the basic gospel. Among these were the Albigenses or Cathari; "Christ's Poor"; the Waldenses, or "The Poor Men of Lyons"; the "Humilates"; the Bohemian Brethren, of the Church of the *Unitas Fratrum:* the revived *Unitas Fratrum* or the Moravian Church; the Schwenkfelders; the German Baptists or Dunkers; the Obbenites; the Mennonites; the Collegiants (which represented a movement for a creedless spiritual worship within the existing denominations); the Simonians; the Socinians; and the Brownists. Some of these were Anabaptist sects.

Hershberger describes these sects thus: "Alongside the mediaeval church there were certain small, intimate groups of Christians who refused to accept a compromise with the social order. They stood aloof and maintained that indifference or hostility to the world which characterized the primitive church. These groups are known as the sects. They generally refused to use the law, to take the oath, to exercise domination over others, or to participate in war. Theirs was not an ascetic emphasis on heroic and vicarious achievement. It was not an opposition, in most cases, to the sense life or the average life of humanity, but simply an opposition to the social institutions of the world.

"The sects generally emphasized lay religion, personal ethical achievement, religious equality, brotherly love, indifference to the state and the ruling classes, dislike of the law and oath, and the ideal of poverty and frugality, direct personal religious relationship, appeal to the primitive church, criticism of the theologians. They always demanded a high standard of moral performance. This made for small groups, of course, but what they lost in the spirit of universalism, they made up for in intensity of life. This tradition of the sects was carried down from the Montanists and Dontanists through the Waldensians to the followers of Wycliff and Huss to the Anabaptists."[27]

Describing one of the non-resistant sects, the Mennonities, C. Henry Smith writes: "They adopted bodily the faith of the peaceful type of Anabaptists, and that was a rejection of all civil and a great deal of the prevailing ecclesiastical government as unnecessary for the Christian". They "went no further, however, in their opposition to the temporal authority than to declare that the true church and the temporal powers had nothing in common and must be entirely separate; not only must the state not interfere with the church, but the true Christian must be entirely free from participating in civil matters. The temporal authority must needs exist, since it was instituted of God to punish the wicked, but in that work the Christian had no hand. This position they reached from a literal interpretation of the Sermon on the Mount, where Christ taught his disciples, among other things, to 'love their enemies' and to 'swear not at all'. Hence their position involved opposition to the oath, holding of office, and bearing of arms."[28]

In 1917 in America the general conference and various branches of the Mennonite Church united in addressing a signed "Appeal to the President" in which they said: "Because of our understanding of the teachings of Christ and New Testament generally against war in any form, we can render no service, either combatant or non-combatant, under the military establishment, but will rather be amenable to any punishment the government sees fit to lay upon us as a penalty".[29]

Active Reconciliation

The nonviolence of this group, favouring the use of active goodwill and reconciliation, is based upon principle. It refers not only to outward actions, but to personal reconciliation and improvement of one's own life before attempting to change others. "Its proponents seek to accomplish a positive alteration in the attitude and policy of the group or person responsible for some undesirable situation; but they never use coercion—even nonviolent coercion. Rather they seek to convince their opponent. . . . They place their emphasis on the positive action of goodwill which they *will* use rather than upon a catalogue of violent actions which they will not use."[30] A large part of the basis of this approach is the importance placed on the worth of every individual and the belief that he can change. Direct action and strategy are not involved. Tolstoy and many of his followers, and much of the present Society of Friends (Quakers), are proponents of this type of generic nonviolence. So also are many other individual pacifists.

Tolstoy rejected the use of violence under all circumstances and also private property and association with institutions which practise coercion over men. Tolstoy depended upon the power of example and goodwill to influence men. He sought a regeneration of society as a whole through the practice of love in all one's relationships, simple living, self-service, and the persuasion of others to follow this way of life.[31] In Tolstoy's own words: ". . . it is this acknowledgement of the law of love as the supreme law of human life, and this clearly expressed guidance for conduct resulting from the Christian teaching of love, embracing enemies and those who hate, offend and curse us, that constitute the peculiarity of Christ's teaching, and by giving to the doctrine of love, and to the guidance flowing therefrom, an exact and definite meaning, inevitably involve a complete change of the established organization of life, not only in Christendom, but among all the nations of the earth."[32] "The time will come—it is already coming—when the Christian principles of equality and fraternity, community of property, non-resistance of evil by force, will appear just as natural and simple as the principles of family or social life seem to us now."[33] "The Christian will not dispute with any one, nor attack any one, nor use violence against any one. On the contrary, he will bear violence without opposing it. But by this very attitude to violence, he will not only himself be free, but will free the whole world from all external power."[34]

George Fox and the early Quakers recognised religious experience as the final authority in religion, in place of the Scriptures which were the authority of the non-resistant sects and other Protestants. The Friends believe that the life of every person, however degraded, has worth and is guided by an Inner Light (sometimes called "the spirit of Christ"). This rules out any right to constrain men by means of violence. Also involved in it is the conviction that men should live the kind of life which removes the occasion for wars and builds a world of peace. Friends in general have not completely rejected the use of force by a civil government[35] and often today work for the adoption of legislation and sometimes hold office, even as judges.

Early Quakers, believing in the imminence of the spiritual regeneration of the world, eventually identified themselves with the civil government, expecting to administer to affairs of state on the principles of love, kindness and goodwill. With most Quakers there was a fundamental difference between the use of force in personal relations and by the military on one hand, and by a civil government on the other. After some years of Quaker administration in Pennsylvania, the Quakers withdrew from the government. There is variation in opinion on the matter among presentday Quakers, many of whom are not pacifists. Quakers have made large efforts at international relief and reconstruction, international conciliation and peace education, social reform activities and conscientious objection.

Quakers describe their belief in peace in such terms as these: "The conviction that the spirit of Christ dwells in the souls of all men is the source of our refusal to take part in war, and of our opposition to slavery and oppression in every form. We believe that the primary Christian duty in relation to others is to appeal to that of God in them and, therefore, any method of oppression or violence that renders such an appeal impossible must be set out on one side."[36]

"There is a right and possible way for the family of nations to live together at peace. . . . It is the way of active, reconciling love, of overcoming evil with good. We feel an inward compulsion, which we cannot disregard, to strive to follow the way of constructive goodwill, despite the sense of our own shortcomings and despite the failure, in which we have shared, to labour sufficiently for the Kingdom of God on earth."[37]

"The fundamental ground of our opposition to war is religious and ethical. It attaches to the nature of God as revealed in Christ and to the nature of man as related to Him. . . . The only absolute ground for an unalterable and inevitable opposition to war is one which attaches to the inherent nature of right and wrong, one which springs out of the consciousness of obligation to what the enlightened soul knows ought to be." This peace testimony "never was 'adopted'". For "it is not a policy; it is a conviction of the soul. It cannot be followed at one time and surrendered at another time. . . . The Christian way of life revealed in the New Testament, the voice of conscience revealed in the soul, the preciousness of personality revealed in the transforming force of love, and the irrationality revealed in modern warfare, either together or singly, present grounds which for those who feel them make participation in war under any conditions impossible." Friends "do not rest their case on sporadic texts. They find themselves confronted with a Christianity, the Christianity of the Gospels, that calls for a radical transformation of man, for the creation of a new type of person and for the building of a new social order, and they take this with utmost seriousness as a thing to be ventured and tried."[38]

Persons sharing the "active reconciliation" beliefs often prefer a rather quietist approach to social problems, disliking anything akin to "agitation" or "trouble". Some of them may thus oppose nonviolent resistance and direct action (including strikes, boycotts, etc.,) and even outspoken verbal statements, believing such methods to be violent in spirit, perhaps even immoral, and harmful in their effects on the opponent. They would prefer much more quiet methods, such as personal representations, letters and private deputations.

Moral Resistance

Believers in "moral resistance"—a matter of principle—are convinced that evil should be resisted, but only by peaceful and moral means. The emphasis on individual moral responsibility is an important part of this approach. "Moral resistance" includes both a personal refusal of individuals to participate in evil—such as war or, earlier, slavery—and an imperative for individuals to do something actively against the evil, such as speaking, writing or preaching. Nonviolent resistance and direct action are not ruled out, though the major emphasis is usually placed upon education, persuasion and individual example. Believers in "moral resistance" in Western society, although lacking an over-all social analysis or comprehensive program of social change, generally favour gradual social reform through such methods as legislation, education and efforts to influence government officials.

The pacifism of various peace societies in New England during the middle of the last century was of this type. Adin Ballou and William Lloyd Garrison (of anti-slavery fame) were well-known spokesmen for these groups.[39] A part of the "Declaration of Sentiments" (written by Garrison) adopted by the Peace Convention, Boston, 18-20 September 1838 reads: "We register our testimony, not only against all wars, whether offensive or defensive but all preparations for war. . . . Hence we deem it unlawful to bear arms or to hold a military office. . . . As a measure of sound policy . . . as well as on the ground of allegiance to Him who is King of Kings and Lord of Lords, we cordially adopt the Non-Resistance principle, being confident that it provides for all possible consequences, will ensure all things needful to us, is armed with omnipotent power, and must ultimately triumph over assailing force. . . .

"But while we shall adhere to the doctrine of Non-Resistance and passive submission to enemies, we purpose, in a moral and spiritual sense, to speak and act boldly; to assail iniquity, in high places and in low places; to apply our principles to all existing civil, political, legal and ecclesiastical institutions. . . . We shall employ lecturers, circulate tracts and publications, form societies, and petition our state and national governments, in relation to the subject of *universal peace.* It will be our leading object to devise ways and means for effecting a radical change in the views, feelings and practices of society, respecting the sinfulness of war and the treatment of enemies."[40]

"The term non-resistance . . . requires very considerable qualifications. I use it as applicable only to the conduct of human beings towards human beings—not towards the inferior animals, inanimate thing or satanic influences. . . . But I go further, and disclaim using the term to express *absolute passivity* even towards human beings. I claim the right to offer the utmost moral resistance, not sinful, of which God has made me capable, to every manifestation of evil among mankind. Nay, I hold it my *duty* to offer such moral resistance. In this sense my very non-resistance becomes the highest kind of resistance to evil. . . . There is an uninjurious, benevolent *physical* force. There are cases in which it would not only be allowable, but in the highest degree commendable, to *restrain* human beings by this kind of force . . . as maniacs, the delirious, the intoxicated, etc. And in cases where deadly violence is inflicted with deliberation and malice of forethought, one may nobly throw his body as a temporary barrier between the destroyer and his helpless victim, choosing to die in that position, rather than be a passive spectator. Thus another most important qualification is given to the term non-resistance. . . . It is simply non-resistance of injury with injury—evil with evil."[41]

Garrison states his interpretation of "non-resistance" in these terms: "Non-Resistance is . . . a state of activity, ever fighting the good fight of faith, ever foremost to assail unjust power, ever struggling for liberty, equality, fraternity, in no national sense, but in a world-wide spirit. It is passive only in this sense—that it will not return evil for evil, nor give blow for blow, nor resort to murderous weapons for protection or defence."[42]

He illustrates the "moral resistance" attitude towards methods to be used in a social struggle in his speech at the New England Abolitionists Convention, Boston, 26 May 1858: "When the anti-slavery cause was launched it was baptized in the spirit of peace. . . . I do not believe that the weapons of liberty ever have been, or ever can be, the weapons of despotism. I know that those of despotism are the sword, the revolver, the cannon, the bomb shell; and therefore, the weapons to which tyrants cling, and upon which they depend, are not the weapons for me, as a friend of liberty. I will not trust the war spirit anywhere in the universe of God, because the experience of six thousand years proves it not to be at all reliable in such a struggle as ours. . . . I pray you, Abolitionists, still adhere to that truth. . . . Blood . . . shall not flow through any counsel of mine. Much as I detest the oppression exercised by the Southern slave holder, he is a man, sacred before me. . . . I have no other weapon to wield against him but the simple truth of God, which is the great instrument for the overthrow of all iniquity and the salvation of the world."[43]

A very large part of contemporary Western pacifists is of this type, although there is variation within the membership of most of the pacifist organizations. The U.S. Fellowship of Reconciliation (a religious, largely Christian, pacifist organisation), for example, contains members sharing the non-resistance and active reconciliation positions, although it is probable that a very large percentage belong in the moral resistance category. The organization's Statement of Purpose largely reflects this position:

"Although members do not bind themselves to any exact form of words, they refuse to participate in any war or to sanction military preparations; they work to abolish war and to foster goodwill among nations, races and classes; they strive to build a social order which will suffer no individual or groups to be exploited for the profit or pleasure of another, and which will ensure to all the means for realizing the best possibilities of life; they advocate such ways of dealing with offenders against society as shall transform the wrongdoer rather than inflict retributive punishment; they endeavour to show reverence for personality —in the home, in the education of children, in association with those of other classes, nationalities and races; they seek to avoid bitterness and contention, and to maintain the spirit of self-giving love while engaged in the struggle to achieve these purposes."[44]

A non-Western example of "moral resistance" is the pacifism of the traditional Hopi Indian Nation. They are now seeking to spread their views which they believe may be helpful to other people. Dan Kachongva, leading adviser and spokesman of the traditional Hopis, says that people are turning away from the Life Plan of the Great Spirit. "Each and every human being knows these simple instructions upon which are based all the various Life Plans and religions of the Great Spirit", he said. The laws of the Great Spirit must be followed even though they might conflict with other "laws". All the various instructions of the Great Spirit came from "the seed of one basic instruction: 'You must not kill; you must love your neighbour as yourself'. From this one commandment to respect and reverence life, came all the other commandments: to tell the truth, to share what we have; to live together so we can help each other out; to take care of our children and old people, the sick and strangers, friends and enemies; to not get drunk, or commit adultery, or lie or cheat, or steal, or get rich, because all these negative acts cause fights and struggles which divide the community into groups too small to support and carry on the life stream."[45]

Selective Nonviolence

The chief characteristic of "selective nonviolence" is the refusal to participate in *particular* violent conflicts, usually international wars. In certain other situations the same persons might be willing to use violence to accomplish the desired ends. The two most obvious examples are the international Socialists, especially during World War I, and Jehovah's Witnesses. Also included are non-pacifist anarchists, objectors primarily concerned with authoritarianism, and other non-pacifists who believe that the manufacture and use of nuclear weapons can never be justified.

The international Socialists object to war because, they declare, it is a product of capitalism, and there is no reason why the workers of one country should fight the workers of another when the real enemy of the workers of all countries is capitalism. Most, but not all,[46] of the Socialist objectors to World War I would have participated in a violent revolution of the working people to abolish capitalism, imperialism and greed, and to bring in the cooperative commonwealth. Their objections were intimately tied up with their conception of the class struggle. This conception is reflected in the 1917 St Louis Manifesto, overwhelmingly approved by the Socialist Party, U.S.A.

"The Socialist Party of the United States in the present grave crisis reaffirms its allegiance to the principle of internationalism and working-class solidarity the world over, and proclaims its unalterable opposition to the war just declared by the government of the United States. . . . The mad orgy of death which is now convulsing unfortunate Europe was caused by the conflict of capitalist interests in European countries. In each of these countries the workers were oppressed and exploited. . . . The ghastly war in Europe . . . was the logical outcome of the competitive capitalist system. . . . Our entrance into the European war was instigated by the predatory capitalists of the United States who boast of the enormous profits of seven billion dollars from the manufacture and sale of munitions and war supplies and from the exportation of American foodstuffs and other necessities. . . . We brand the declaration of war by our government as a crime against the people of the United States and against the nations of the world."[47]

The same majority report also stated: ". . . the only struggle which would justify the workers in taking up arms is the great struggle of the working class of the world to free itself from economic exploitation and political oppression . . ."[48]

At a party State Convention in Canton, Ohio, Eugene Debs declared: "The master class has always declared the wars; the subject class has always fought the battles. The master class has had all to gain and nothing to lose, while the subject class has had nothing to gain and all to lose—especially their lives."[49] On trial in 1918 for violation of the U.S. Sedition Act on ten counts allegedly committed during that speech, Debs told the jury: "It (the St Louis Manifesto) said, in effect, to the people, especially the workers, of all countries, 'Quit going to war. Stop murdering one another for the profit and glory of the ruling classes. Cultivate the arts of peace. Humanize humanity. Civilize civilization' ."[50]

In Britain, the Independent Labour Party; in the United States, the Socialist Party, U.S.A., and the Socialist Labour Party; in Russia, the *Bolsheviki*; and in Germany, the group of Socialists led by Karl Liebnecht and Rosa Luxemburg opposed World War I. Most other Socialist groups abandoned the Socialist doctrine on war at that time. Only a few Socialists opposed World War II on similar grounds. The Socialist Party, U.S.A. (only a remnant of the earlier party), for example, tried to maintain a position of "neutrality" on the war, neither supporting nor opposing it, while some of its members gave full support, some gave critical support, and some opposed it. In most countries, Socialist groups fully supported the war.

Jehovah's Witnesses[51] also object to particular violent conflicts. They regard all governments that took part in World War II as being equally guilty. The existing governments of all nations are regarded as being ruled by Satan; the Witnesses declare that the existing governments have failed because they merely rendered lip service to morality. To support any such government is to support Satan and to deny God. The present wars are regarded as merely a sign of the end of an age and a preliminary worldly step before the righteous King Jesus soon returns to establish his heavenly rule on earth. The people of goodwill will survive the Battle of Armageddon, which will be fought by angels against Satan's organization, "carry out the divine mandate to 'fill the earth' with a righteous race".[52] The Witnesses are not prohibited from using violence in their personal relationships or in resisting persecution, as they once were. If God were concerned with the present wars, as he was with some earlier ones, they would be willing to fight. The Witnesses were sent to conscientious objector camps, interned, imprisoned, or sent to concentration camps by both sides during World War II.[53]

Stroup, in his study of the movement, writes: "The law of God forbids the Witnesses to engage in war. The view has commonly been taken that they are pacifists. Such they are not, for they feel that they must often employ physical force to resist persecution, and they also believe that Jehovah has engaged in and encouraged wars between peoples. The Witnesses will not engage in the present war [World War II] because they think that Jehovah is not concerned with it; otherwise they would be quite willing to fight. Most of them believe that Satan is 'running the whole show' and therefore they will have nothing to do with it. This is similar to their attitude towards the first World War. The Witnesses were interned by both sides, because the Society boldly stated that the war was being fought by equally selfish interests and without the sanction of God. Their own fight, they declared, was not fought with 'carnal weapons': it was a battle of cosmic proportions with the adversary of every man, Satan."[54]

The position of certain non-pacifist but anti-war anarchists would come under this classification also. Their position is similar to that of the international Socialists, in that they under certain circumstances would be willing to use violence to abolish the existing order of society to bring in the classless, stateless, and warless society of their dreams. For example, both the principals charged with murder in the famous Sacco-Vanzetti case had gone to Mexico during World War I to avoid military conscription.[55] In the last interview with W.G. Thompson before their execution, Vanzetti said "he feared that nothing but violent resistance could ever overcome the selfishness which was the basis of the present organization of society and made the few willing to perpetuate a system which enabled them to exploit the many".[56]

In his speech to the court on 9 April 1927, anarchist Vanzetti said: ". . . the jury were hating us because we were against the war, and the jury don't know that it makes any difference between a man that is against the war because he believes that the war is unjust, because he hates no country, because he is a cosmopolitan, and a man that is against the war because he is in favour of the other country . . . and therefore, a spy, an enemy. . . . We are not men of that kind. . . . We were against the war because we did not believe in the purpose for which they say that war was fought. We believed that the war is wrong. . . . We believe more now than ever that the war was wrong, and we are against war more now than ever, and I am glad to be on the doomed scaffold if I can say to mankind, 'Look out. . . . All that they say to you, all that they have promised to you—it was a lie, it was an illusion, it was a cheat, it was a fraud, it was a crime. . . .' Where is the moral good that the war has given to the world? Where is the spiritual progress that we have achieved from the war? Where are the security of life, the security of the things that we possess for our necessity? Where are the respect for human life? Where are the respect and the admiration for the good characteristics and the good of human nature? Never before the war as now have there been so many crimes, so much corruption, so much degeneration as there is now."[57]

Also included in the category of "selective nonviolence" are a number of individuals whose objection to participation in modern wars is not essentially an objection to violence *per se*, but rather to authoritarianism in government, institutions and even individuals. They have thus refused to cooperate with military conscription and have received the consequences of such noncooperation. Norman Thomas[58] mentions a type of "conscientious objection by radicals (which) was based rather on an objection to conscription rather than to killing" and Case says:

"A type of objector . . . directs his protest against *conscription* in and of itself, without regard for the right or wrong of war in general or of the particular war in question."[59] Their objection is to ordering individuals around, as contrasted to allowing their free action and development. They may, however, use violence in their personal lives. Some of these oppose participation in modern war because they view it as an extreme development of both regimentation and violence.

Those individuals who now believe that preparations for nuclear war cannot under any conditions be justified, though they believe that war with earlier weapons has, at least at times, been justified, are also included is this category of "selective nonviolence".

Passive resistance

Passive resistance is a method of conducting conflicts and achieving or thwarting social, economic or political changes. It is preferred to violent resistance, not for reasons of principle, but because either the resisters lack the means of violence or are not likely to win by such methods. The aim is to harass the opponent without employing physical violence, and to force him to make the desired concessions whether or not he desires to do so. Passive resistance may be used as a supplement to physical violence, as a preparation for it, following its unsuccessful use, or as a full substitute for physical violence. "Passive resistance" denotes actions which are not primarily self-initiated, motivated or directed, but instead are mainly reactions to the initiative of the opponent. The attitude of the resisters may involve hatred. They are not concerned in a major way with their own character, spiritual condition or way of living, but mainly in combating what they regard as a social evil.

"Passive resistance" may be practised on the local, regional, national or international level. A large number of strikes,[60] boycotts,[61] and national non-cooperation movements are of this type of generic nonviolence. The latter include, for example, the Hungarian resistance against Austrian rule, 1850-1867,[62] and Egyptian non-cooperation against British rule, 1919-1922.[63] Other examples are strikes in the political prisoner camps in the

Soviet Union,[64] and the 1942 Norwegian teachers' resistance which prevented the use of the schools for Nazi indoctrination and was the most important of several actions in halting Quisling's plans for instituting the Corporate State in Norway.[65]

Peaceful Resistance

"Peaceful resistance" is *primarily* a method of conducting conflicts and achieving or thwarting social, political or economic changes. In contrast to passive resistance, there is in it a relatively widespread recognition of nonviolent methods as being intrinsically better than violence and that they are exclusively the methods to be used in the struggle. Many, most, or even all, of the participants in "peaceful resistance" may adhere to a temporary nonviolent discipline only of the particular struggle. "Practical" considerations are still important. Nonviolent methods of resistance may be regarded as more likely to achieve the desired results than (1) violent resistance, (2) reliance on established governmental constitutional procedures, or (3) verbal persuasion without supporting action. But despite the limited nature of the adherence to nonviolence, a belief in the relative moral superiority of nonviolent over violent methods widely, and at times deeply, permeates the resistance movements. A slight variation on this is that the use of nonviolent methods of resistance may be regarded as intrinsically more "democratic" than either violent resistance or passive acceptance of what are regarded as social evils; hence the nonviolent methods may also gain an aura of "rightness" on this ground.

A widespread belief among the resisters in the relative moral superiority of nonviolent methods may have several causes. Where there is a distinguishable leadership in the movement, such a belief may arise from one of three causes: (1) an important section of the leadership may be pacifist—that is, they may believe in nonviolence as a moral principle; (2) although none of the leaders may be pacifists, some or all of them may believe that nonviolent methods are considerably morally superior to violent methods and that violence should be used only in the most extreme conditions (not likely to arise during the struggle in question); or (3) both convinced pacifists and persons believing in the *relative* moral superiority of nonviolent methods may be among the leadership.

Two further factors may operate whether or not there is a distinguishable leadership (and, if there is, in addition to one or other of the causes mentioned above). These are: (1) there may be among the resisters a sufficient number of pacifists to enable them, through numbers or disproportionate influence, to "colour" the struggle and help maintain it on a nonviolent basis even under severe provocation; and (2) the resisters may have been so repelled by previous experience of extreme social violence that they are determined to conduct this struggle without violence.

"Peaceful resistance" is generally more active than "passive resistance". The degree of conscious use of strategy and tactics in peaceful resistance struggles may vary considerably. The "bias" in favour of nonviolent methods helps to keep the struggle nonviolent in spite of provocations and difficulties which might turn "passive resisters" to violence. This "bias" may also have certain social-psychological effects advantageous to the aims of the peaceful resistance movement. There is considerable variation in the degree to which peaceful resistance movements aim at changing the opponent's attitudes and values as well as policies.

The best examples of peaceful resistance are the Montgomery, Alabama, 1955-57 bus boycott and the resistance campaigns led or inspired by Gandhi in which most of the resisters and even part of the leadership were following nonviolent methods only as a policy for achieving the objective of the struggle. Although almost none of the participants or leaders of the Montgomery Negroes' bus boycott were avowed pacifists, the movement had a strong religious character. It was constantly emphasised that the nonviolent way was the Christian way, and that the Negroes should love the whites while refusing to ride the segregated buses.[66]

Nearly all of the resistance movements led or inspired by Gandhi are classified under "peaceful resistance", although Gandhi's satyagraha is recognized in this typology as one of the nine types of generic nonviolence. This is because of the very real differences between these struggles and Gandhi's full approach. Gandhi called the types of nonviolence practised in such resistance movements the "nonviolence of the weak" as contrasted to the "nonviolence of the brave" based on inner conviction.[67] He believed that the former would achieve certain limited goals but its effect would not be so great as the latter's. In his later years, Gandhi distinguished more sharply between these, saying that the "nonviolence of the weak" was not genuine satyagraha.[68] These movements include, for example, the 1928 Bardoli peasants struggle[69] and the 1930-31 independence struggle.[70]

Other examples of "peaceful resistance" include: the 1952 South African "Defy Unjust Laws" campaign,[71] the Korean resistance against Japanese oppression between 1919 and approximately 1921,[72] the Samoan Islanders' resistance against New Zealand rule from 1920 to 1936,[73] the 1953 strike at Vorkuta prison camp by 250,000 political prisoners in the Soviet Union[74] and the 1956 Japanese resistance against construction of a United States Air Force base at Sunakawa, Japan.[75]

Nonviolent Direct Action

"Nonviolent direct action" is a method of producing or thwarting social, economic or political changes by direct nonviolent *intervention* aimed at establishing new patterns or policies or disrupting the institution of new patterns or policies regarded as undesirable or evil. The motivation of "nonviolent direct actionists" may vary from belief in nonviolence as a moral principle to adherence to a temporary nonviolent discipline as a practical method to achieve a particular objective. There is variation in the degree to which the act of intervention is intended to bring about a change in the opponent's attitudes or values or simply to produce a change in the policy in question. The direct action may follow investigation of the facts, discussion with those responsible for the policy found objectionable, negotiations, public appeals and publicity about the grievance. An act of "self-purification", such as prayer, fasting etc., may or may not precede the direct action.

Examples of nonviolent direct action include: (1) the 1924-25

Vykom "Satyagraha"[76] in South India in which the direct actionists attempted to end the prohibition against Harijans' (untouchables) using a road passing a Hindu temple by simply walking up it, and when halted by a police barricade, keeping vigil in shifts on the road day and night for fourteen months until allowed to proceed;[77] (2) the Helegolanders' nonviolent seizure in 1951 of the island of Helegoland (off the coast of Germany) from the British Royal Air Force which had been using it for bombing target practice;[78] (3) various projects of the Congress of Racial Equality against racial segregation and discrimination in the U.S.A. in which mixed Negro-White groups have politely insisted on equal treatment for Negroes often by waiting for hours for service, admission, etc. in restaurants, theatres and public transportation until the policy was changed, or it was closing time, or they were arrested, and returning repeatedly until Negroes received equal treatment;[79] and (4) the "nonviolent invasion" in Britain by supporters and members of the Direct Action Committee Against Nuclear War of the North Pickenham rocket base in December 1958, using such techniques as lying in front of trucks and obstructing the use of the concrete mixer in efforts to halt further construction.[80]

Satyagraha

Satyagraha is the type of generic nonviolence developed by Mohandas K. Gandhi. It means (approximately) "adherence to Truth" or "reliance on Truth"—Truth having the connotation of Essence of Being, or reality. The believer in satyagraha, a satyagrahi,[81] aims at attaining Truth through love and right action. Satyagraha is a matter of principle.[82] It was developed by Gandhi through his searchings and experiments in his personal life, and his efforts at combating social evils and building a better social order. The satyagrahi seeks to "turn the searchlight inward" and to improve his own life so that he does no harm to others. He seeks to combat evil in the world through his own way of living, constructive work, and resistance and action against what are regarded as evils. He seeks to convert the opponent through sympathy, patience, truthfulness, and self-suffering. He believes that sufficient truthfulness, fearlessness and deep conviction will enable him to attack that which he regards as evil, regardless of the odds against him. He will not compromise on basic moral issues though he may on secondary matters. Gandhi left behind no systematised philosophical system. He dealt with practical problems as they arose and sought solutions for them within the context of his basic ethical principles: satya (truth) ahimsa (non-injury to living beings in thought, word and deed) and equality. The satyagrahi believes that means and ends must be equally pure. Gandhi regarded satyagraha as basically a matter of quality rather than quantity. When facing social conflict, he believed the satyagrahi's own inner condition was more important than the external situation.

A basic part of satyagraha in Gandhi's view was a constructive program to build a new social and economic order through voluntary constructive work. This he regarded as more important than resistance. The Indian constructive program included a variety of specific measures aimed at social improvement, education, decentralized economic production and consumption, and improvement in the lot of the oppressed sections of the population. He belived that such a program gradually builds up the structure of a new nonviolent society, while resistance and direct action are used to remove parts of the old structure which are obstacles to the new one.

When social evils require direct and active challenging, Gandhi believed, the various methods of peaceful resistance and nonviolent direct action (in the senses in which the terms are used in this paper) provide a substitute for rioting, violent revolution or war. Gandhi has made a unique contribution in combining nonviolence as a principle with the techniques and strategy of resistance, forging it into a method of meeting social conflicts which was regarded as more influential than both individual example and persuasion without such supporting action and the previous forms of nonviolent resistance. Investigation, negotiation, publicity, self-purification, temporary work stoppages, picketing, boycotts, non-payment of taxes, mass migration from the State, various forms of non-cooperation, civil disobedience and the fast (under strict limitations) are among possible methods of action. The satyagrahi is always ready to negotiate a settlement which does not compromise basic principles.

Gandhi became convinced that satyagraha based on inner conviction was more effective than non-violence practised as a temporary policy. He said of the "nonviolence of the brave": "It is such nonviolence that moves mountains, transforms life and flinches from nothing in its unshakable faith".[83] Satyagraha when developed by Gandhi became unique among the existing types of generic nonviolence by being a matter of principle, a program for social reconstruction and an active individual and group method of attacking what are regarded as social evils.[84]

Nonviolent Revolution

"Nonviolent revolution" is the most recent type of generic nonviolence. It is still very much a direction of developing thought and action, rather than a movement possessing a fixed ideology and program. "Nonviolent revolutionaries" believe that the major social problems of today's world have their origins at the roots of individual and social life and, therefore, can be solved only by a basic, or revolutionary, change in individuals and society.

There is general recognition among believers in this approach of four aspects of a nonviolent revolutionary program: (1) improvement by individuals of their own lives, (2) gaining the acceptance of such values as nonviolence, equality, cooperation, justice and freedom as the determining values for the society as a whole, (3) building a more egalitarian, decentralized and libertarian social order, and (4) combating what are regarded as social evils by nonviolent resistance and direct action.[85] A major objective of nonviolent revolution is to substitute nonviolent, cooperative, egalitarian relationships for such aspects of violence as exploitation, oppression and war. The nonviolent revolution is to be effected largely (in the view of some) or entirely (in the view of others) without use of the state machinery. Some advocates of this approach place relatively more emphasis on achieving changes in policies, institutions, ownership, power relationship, etc., while others put relatively more emphasis on achieving changes in beliefs and attitudes as a preliminary to such social changes.

The nonviolent revolutionary approach has been developing at least since about 1945[86] in various parts of the world including Hong Kong[87], Germany[88], the United States[89], India and England. Nonviolent revolution has a mixed origin. This may, for the purposes of analysis, be roughly divided into those in which ideological factors are predominant and those in which they are subordinate to "practical" efforts to find solutions to certain pressing social problems. The "ideological" and "practical" factors are, however, never fully separated. On one hand, the ideologies concerned propose solutions for problems, and on the other, the search for solutions for such problems at some stage inevitably involves consideration of ideological approaches *per se*, or methods of action which are closely related to them. On the ideological level nonviolent revolution has been developing through the interplay and synthesis of several formerly distinct approaches. These include (1) certain types of pacifism, largely "moral resistance" and the Tolstoyan and Quaker approaches ("active reconciliation"), (2) satyagraha and (3) ideologies of social revolution (i. e., basic social change), including the socialist, anarchist and decentralist approaches.[90] In some way satyagraha is the most important of these[91], largely because it combines a "pacifist" position with a method of resistance and revolution, thus serving as a bridge or catalyst between pacifism and social revolution.

On the "practical" level the nonviolent revolutionary approach has had origins in efforts to effect social, political or economic changes where parliamentary means are either non-existent or not responsive to popular control and where violent means are rejected either because the means of effective violent struggle are predominantly at the disposal of supporters of the *status quo*, or for other reasons. Nonviolent resistance and direct action have often appeared relevant in such situations. What seems to be an increasing reliance on nonviolent resistance and direct action by liberation movements is an illustration of this. Where nonviolent methods have been seriously used in such situations, there have often been ideological and programmatic consequences resulting from the combination of nonviolence and revolution. An associated factor in the development of nonviolent revolution is that common concern with pressing social problems (land in India, nuclear weapons in Britain, freedom in South Africa, for example) has brought pacifists, satyagrahis and social revolutionaries[92] together to find and apply solutions for such problems. This interaction has contributed to the synthesizing of these approaches.

Because of the newness of this type of nonviolence, it is perhaps desirable to cite at greater length than usual examples of the thought which underlies it. These citations, largely from American and Indian sources, are to be regarded as only illustrative.

The Rev. Michael Scott has written: "There is the urgent need for a new revolutionary movement which will have the courage and incentive to use methods of nonviolent resistance not only against the manufacture of nuclear weapons but against oppressive legislation and violations of human rights and natural justice", and which would be capable of a strong "effectual fight against oppression and injustice", ignorance and poverty.[93]

Although the nonviolent revolutionary movement has never developed in the United States to anything approaching political significance, some of the clearest ideological statements of this approach have come from that country. For example, in 1946 there existed a Committee for Nonviolent Revolution which issued this policy statement:

> We favour decentralized, democratic socialism guaranteeing worker-consumer control of industries, utilities and other economic enterprises. We believe that the workers themselves should take steps to seize control of factories, mines and shops. . . . We believe in realistic action against war, against imperialism and against military or economic oppression by conquering nations, including the United States. We advocate such techniques of group resistance as demonstrations, strikes, organized civil disobedience, and underground organization where necessary. As individuals we refuse to join the armed forces, work in war industries, or buy government bonds, and we believe in campaigns urging others to do similarly. We see nonviolence as a principle as well as as a technique. In all action we renounce the methods of punishing, hating or killing any fellow human beings. We believe that nonviolence includes such methods as sit-down strikes and seizure of plants.

> We believe that revolutionary changes can only occur through direct action by the rank and file, and not by deals or reformist proposals directed to the present political and labour leadership.[94]

A. J. Muste, in the period following the Committee for Nonviolent Revolution, was the leading exponent of the nonviolent revolutionary approach: ". . . mankind faces a major crisis. Only a drastic change, such as is suggested by the terms rebirth, conversion, revolution, can bring deliverance. Tinkering with this or that piece of political, economic or cultural machinery will not suffice. . . . War and the war system, as well as social violence, are inherent in our present politico-economic order and the prevailing materialistic culture. . . . War is not inevitable, though it is certain to come unless a revolutionary movement against war and materialism soon comes into existence."[95] "A nonviolent revolution changes external relationships and managements but it is primarily an inner revolution, a rebirth of a man."[96] ". . . the present period is a profoundly revolutionary one and its problem is a revolutionary problem. . . . This order is . . . bound to perish . . . because . . . the law of the universe that exploitation, hatred, tyranny are evil and cannot endure is being vindicated. Therefore, once again, as the ground is swept clear the chance to build a revolutionary new order presents itself to mankind. . . . It is not our business to save either capitalism or Communism; either the Russian or the Amercian power state; either the Western Capitalist culture or the present Communist culture. None of them now enshrines or allows for the flourishing of essentially democratic and humane values . . . in our age, whatever may have been the case in other periods . . . violence must be rejected as a means for radical social change. . . . Whether . . . we look at the problem of eliminating war or at the problem of radical social change (abolition of competitive nationalism, colonialism, dictatorship, feudalism, development of a non-exploitative economy, etc.) we must resort to nonviolence or we are lost. We need to build a nonviolent revolutionary movement . . . rooted firmly in local and national situations . . . not . . . abstract cosmopolitanism . . . [yet] genuinely internationalist in basis, composition and eventual structure."[97]

In India the nonviolent revolutionary approach has taken two forms, often regarded by their respective advocates as distinct. One is the bhudan (land-gift) and related movements led by Vinoba Bhave. The other is the emphasis on civil disobedience, most clearly espoused by Dr Rammanohar Lohia and his Socialist Party of India, but also advocated at times by the larger Praja Socialist Party and other groups.

Concerning nonviolent revolution, Dr Lohia has written: "Hitherto, in efforts to bring about major social changes, the world has known the sole alternatives of parliamentary and violent insurrectionary means. A reliance on only parliamentary means has often left people without any means of direct control over social decisions when Parliament was not responsive to the public will, and parliamentary means have sometimes proved incapable of bringing about genuinely fundamental changes in society when required. The reliance upon the means of violent insurrection has, however, also been proved inadequate. Even apart from considerations of the morality of violence and its chances of success, the kind of society produced by a violent insurrection does not recommend such means. Now, however, a new dimension has been added by the addition of individual and massive civil resistance as another way of bringing about major social changes. . . . All those desirous of maintaining methods of nonviolence must learn to be equally loyal to revolution. . . . Where such subordination of revolution to nonviolence takes place, conservative maintenance of the existing order is an inevitable result, just as chaos in the beginning and tyranny afterwards are inevitable results if nonviolence is subordinated to revolution. . . . Mankind will ever hurtle from the hands of one irresponsibility into another if it continues to seek and organise its revolutions through violence."[98]

Commenting on bhudan as a social revolution, the Indian economist Gyan Chand has written: "The target of collecting 50 million acres before the end of 1957 for distribution among the landless labourers has not been realised, and more than half of the four million actually collected have still to be distributed. And yet the movement is gathering more steam, has made gramdans—voluntary extinction of property rights in entire villages—

its immediate objective and attained a large measure of success in realizing it. . . . A real recluse [Vinoba] has left the seclusion of his ashram and is using his piety, spiritual communion and comprehension of life and its essence for bringing about basic social changes and undermining the *status quo*—the network of property relations, the institutional framework and the whole complex of views, conventions, attitudes and norms and patterns of behaviour. Religion is being brought into action as a revolutionary force, as a means of awakening the people to the inequalities of the present economic relations and the urgent need of replacing them by new relations based on a genuine community of feeling and quest for equality in status, income and assignment of functions. . . .

"From the very beginning the bhudan movement has been a movement for establishing a new social order. . . . The collection and distribution of land, it was . . . very clearly emphasized, was . . . only the first step in a succession of changes which were implicit in the concept of social revolution. Among them, a classless society, extinction of property rights and the elimination of acquisitive social relations had necessarily to be given a very high priority in the list of the new social objectives. The gramdan concept brings these social objectives to the fore, stresses their primacy and urgency and points to the need of making them all-embracing and the basis of the whole production organization of the community. This means that if extinction of property rights in land is realized, the very logic of the step would make its application to trade, industry and services unavoidable. . . .

"The movement, relying as it does exclusively on change through assent, that is, on a completely voluntary basis and by nonviolent methods, makes democracy its substance and essential feature. Experience is beginning to show that the movement is gathering momentum and the imminence of radical social changes is becoming more and more obvious and inescapable; and that vested interests . . . are likely to see in the movement a challenge and a danger and to use all their strength for defeating the processes that it has set in motion. This resistance has, according to the premises of the movement, to be met by janashakti—the people's power—the power generated by the will to change and the support of the masses. If the full support of the people is mobilized through education and right guidance and can be sustained, it would create conditions for bringing into action the legislative power of the state in support of the people's will to change. The movement does not in any way preclude legislative action, but does not put its faith in it as the primary or the major instrument of social change. The State has no doubt the organized might of the community at its disposal, but if it is to be truly democratic it has to use this power as sparingly as possible and rely mainly on revolution from below—the upsurge and initiative of the people—for carrying out fundamental and social transformation."[99]

The incomplete nature of the ideology and program of nonviolent revolution is among the factors which have handicapped the spread of this type of generic nonviolence, especially in the West, but the general outline of its approach is sufficiently clear to justify its inclusion in this typology at this early stage of its development and to indicate that it may increase in prominence in the future.

Of these nine types of generic nonviolence, five fall within the definition of "pacifism" presented earlier in this paper; that is, their adherents refuse, on grounds of principle, participation in all international and civil wars and violent revolutions. These are: "non-resistance", "active reconciliation", "moral resistance", "satyagraha", and generally, "nonviolent revolution". These involve a belief in the intrinsic value of nonviolence, as does also "peaceful resistance". Six of the nine types of generic nonviolence emphasise the value of nonviolent behaviour as a method for achieving desired social objectives. These are: "moral resistance", "passive resistance", "peaceful resistance", "nonviolent direct action", "satyagraha", and "nonviolent revolution". There is thus overlapping between these groups, with "moral resistance", "peaceful resistance", "satyagraha" and "nonviolent revolution" emphasising both the intrinsic value of nonviolence and nonviolent behaviour as a method.

Of the nine types, the following always fall within the area of "nonviolent resistance and direct action", as presented earlier in this paper: "passive resistance", "peaceful resistance", and "nonviolent direct action". Often included also would be "moral resistance", "satyagraha" and "nonviolent revolution". On some occasions believers in the approaches classified under "active reconciliation" and "selective nonviolence" might also undertake resistance which would fall within the scope of "nonviolent resistance and direct action". On rare occasions, believers in "non-resistance" might feel compelled to non-cooperate with what they regard as evil in such a way that their behaviour would come within the scope of "nonviolent resistance".

There are, of course, many other comparisons and contrasts which might be made among the nine types of generic nonviolence. Some of these will be suggested by the following chart which indicates in a brief way some of the main characteristics of the types of generic nonviolence. There are related questions which may arise in the minds of some readers, such as the relation between "persuasion", "conversion" and "nonviolent coercion" among the types of generic nonviolence, or an analysis of the various techniques which are used in nonviolent resistance and direct action. These, however, require separate treatment and lie outside the scope of this paper.

The writer's object has been simply to clarify, classify and define—and to illustrate these definitions, particularly where this may have been necessary to bring a sense of reality to descriptions of often relatively little known approaches. The writer does not regard this typology as perfect or final, but hopes that it may help in clarifying the existing confusion about these phenomena and may facilitate future study, research, analysis and evaluation of the various approaches within generic nonviolence.

---

§The first version of this article was a chapter of the writer's M.A. thesis in sociology: *Nonviolence: A Sociological Study* (Ohio State University, 1951). A slightly popularised revision appeared in *Mankind* (Hyderabad), December 1956, under the title 'A Typology of Nonviolence'. A pamphlet reprint of this, under the title *The Meaning of Nonviolence*, was issued in 1957 by Housemans Bookshop, London. The writer then made several major changes and additions, included documentation and completely re-wrote the paper. This revision was published in the American *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, March 1959, under the title "The Meanings of Nonviolence: A Typology". The present version is a further revision containing some new documentation, a more extensive introduction, and statements and descriptions illustrating the respective types of nonviolence within the text itself.

1. "Nonviolence" in this paper refers to the absence of physical violence against human beings. Fuller definitions are offered in subsequent sections.
2. Hershberger, "Biblical Non-resistance and Modern Pacifism", *The Mennonite Quarterly Review*, July 1943; cited by Theodore Paullin, *Introduction to Nonviolence* (Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, Pacifist Research Bureau, 1944) p. 5.
3. "Pacifists" here refers to persons and groups refusing participation in war on ethical, moral or religious grounds.
4. Reynolds, "What Are Pacifists Doing?", *Peace News* (London), 20 July 1956.
5. For example, the U.S. conscription law provides for alternatives to military duty for those objecting to it because of religious belief and training, but denies such alternatives to objectors whose pacifism arises from a personal philosophy, humanitarianism, or social, economic or political views.
6. Military conscription laws throughout the world vary concerning provisions for objectors. Many make no provisions for exemption from military duty or alternative civilian duty. Some include either or both provisions for objectors establishing their sincerity. Still others provide either or both provisions only for certain objectors, such as "religious" ones.
7. As will be indicated below, the term "nonviolence" is used in a much broader sense in this paper than it was by Gandhi.
8. Satyagraha will be defined below.
9. M.K. Gandhi, *The Story of My Experiments With Truth* (Ahmedabad, Navajivan Publishing House, 1956) p. 318.
10. Kumarappa, "Editor's Note" in Gandhi, *For Pacifists* (Ahmedabad, Navajivan Publishing House, 1949).
11. Case, *Nonviolent Coercion: A Study in Methods of Social Pressure* (New York, The Century Company, 1923) p. 287.
12. *Ibid.*, p. 4.
13. Sibley, *The Political Theories of Modern Pacifism: An Analysis and Criticism* (Philadelphia, Pacifist Research Bureau, 1944).
14. See Kuper, *Passive Resistance in South Africa* (London, Jonathan Cape, 1956) p. 75-94.
15. *Op. cit.*
16. *Ibid.*, p. 8.
17. *Ibid.*, p. 9.
18. For example, nonviolent resistance with mixed motives of principle and expediency, and groups rejecting international wars but not necessarily personal violence.
19. For example, including William Lloyd Garrison's approach under "satyagraha and nonviolent direct action".
20. "Generic nonviolence" and "nonviolence" for the purposes of this typology have thus a much broader meaning than that given to "nonviolence"

by Gandhi and certain other votaries of nonviolence. Gandhi often referred to nonviolence as being essentially the same as love. It was ahimsa, which involved non-injury in thought, word and deed to all living things. It rejected ill-will and hatred as well as physical violence. For clarity, the new term "generic nonviolence" will be used hereafter in this paper, now that the subject area has been introduced.

21. "Nonviolent direct action" is discussed as a type of generic nonviolence below in the typology.

22. This classification is similar to Hiller's category, the "generic strike": "This [the generic strike] includes the labour strike, the social boycott, political non-cooperation, demonstrations against official acts, and other similar group conflicts. These various forms of non-participation, although differing in the occasions from which they arise and the ends which they seek, are essentially similar in their methods of coercion and collective control." (E.T. Hiller, *The Strike: A Study in Collective Action*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1928, p. 41.) "Non-participation which is designed to interfere with official acts most frequently takes the form of a refusal to share in the prescribed institutional activities or to participate in political affairs. Occasionally it may involve a suspension of labour." *(Ibid.*, p. 234.)

23. There is no type labelled "conscientious objection" or "war resistance", as such objection or resistance is a specific application of several of the types of generic nonviolence included here.

24. In this revision the writer has tried to offer terminology and definitions which, if adopted, might reduce future confusion in the literature. This has involved making refinements in the existing terminology while seeking to use such terms in ways harmonious with present general usage. Hence, the broader, intermediary classes of "pacifism" and "nonviolent resistance and direct action". Hence, also, the use of the terms "non-resistance", "passive resistance", "satyagraha" and "nonviolent revolution" in ways having clear precedents (although the writer is aware the first two have also been widely used with varying connotations). It has seemed necessary to coin new terms, such as "generic nonviolence", and "selective nonviolence" and to give more specific meanings to "moral resistance" and "peaceful resistance". The writer does not regard this terminology as perfect, but in the absence of an alternative suggests its adoption. The final solution to the terminological problem may lie in creating entirely new terms, such as Gandhi did with satyagraha; the difficulties in gaining their general acceptance, however, might be greater than those of accepting the terms and definitions offered in this paper.

25. This order is inevitably somewhat arbitrary; the most active expression of one type may exceed in activity the most passive expression of the type(s) listed after it.

26. G.H. Heering *The Fall of Christianity* (New York, Fellowship Publications, 1943) p. 33.

27. Guy F. Hershberger, *Quaker Pacifism and the Provincial Government of Pennsylvania 1682-1756* (unpublished Ph.D. thesis, State University of Iowa, 1935) ii, p. 194

28. Smith, *The Mennonites in America*, p. 353-354. Quoted by Clarence Marsh Case, *Nonviolent Coercion: A Study in Methods of Social Pressure* (New York, The Century Company, 1923) p. 78f.

29. Quoted in Case, *op. cit.*, p. 136f.

30. Theodore Paullin, *Introduction to Nonviolence* (Philadelphia, Penn., Pacifist Research Bureau, 1944) p. 43.

31. See Leo Tolstoy, *The Kingdom of God is Within You* (Boston, L.C. Page, 1951);—,*What Then Must We Do?* (Oxford University Press) 281 p.

32. Tolstoy, "The Law of Force and the Law of Love", *The Fortnightly Review* (London, Chapman & Hall, Ltd., 1909) p. 474.

33. Tolstoy, *The Kingdom of God is Within You* (London, William Heinemann, 1894) p. 160.

34. *Ibid.*, p. 306f.

35. See Hershberger, *op. cit.*

36. *The Book of Discipline*, part 1, "Christian Life, Faith and Thought", London Yearly Meeting, 1920. Quoted by Sidney Lucas, *The Quaker Message* (Wallingford, Pa., Pendle Hill, 1948) p. 38f.

37. Philadelphia Yearly Meeting, Arch Street, *Statement on Peace*, adopted by the Yearly Meeting, 1942. Quoted by Lucas, *op. cit.*, p. 43.

38. "Friends and War: A New Statement of the Quaker Position, adopted by the World Conference of All Friends, 1920." Quoted by Case, *op. cit.*, p. 138f.

39. These societies were often called "non-resistance" societies. This is one of the cases where a single term in this field has been used with a variety of meanings. The term "non-resistance" was also used by Tolstoy in a sense which differs from the "non-resistance" type as defined in this article. Adin Ballou, although using the term "non-resistance", makes it clear he advocates a moral resistance to evil.

40. *William Lloyd Garrison; the Story of his Life Told by his Children*, Vol. II (New York, The Century Co., 1885) p. 230. Quoted in Fanny Garrison Villard, *William Lloyd Garrison on Non-Resistance* (New York, The Nation Press, 1924) p. 25-28.

41. Ballou, *Christian Non-Resistance, In All Its Important Bearings, Illustrated and Defended* (Philadelphia, J. Miller M'Kim, 1846) p. 10.

42. *Selections from the Writings and Speeches of William Lloyd Garrison* (Boston, R.F. Wallcut, 1852) p. 88. Quoted in Villard, *op. cit.*, p. 30.

43. *William Lloyd Garrison; the Story of His Life Told by his Children*, Vol. III (New York, 1889) p. 473. Quoted in Villard, *op. cit.*, p. 34-37.

44. *You Asked About the F.O.R.* (Nyack, N.Y., Fellowship of Reconciliation, n.d.) p. 3.

45. Craig, "Preface to a Review of the Hotevilla Meeting of Religious Peoples", MS., 7 p. Quoted in Sharp, "The Hopi Message of Peace for All Mankind", *Peace News*, 14 December 1956, p. 6-7. See also, George Yamada, Editor, *The Great Resistance: A Hopi Anthology* (The Editor, Rm. 825, 5 Beekman St., New York City 38) 75 p.

46. Some of the Socialists were objectors to all forms of social violence.

Whether U.S. Socialist leader, Eugene V. Debs would have used violent means for the socialist revolution is problematical. His statements on this are sometimes contradictory.

47. Quoted in Ray Ginger, *The Bending Cross: A Biography of Eugene V. Debs* (New Brunswick, Rutgers University Press, 1949) p. 341f.

48. Quoted by Case, *op. cit.*, p. 260.

49. Ginger, *op.cit.*, p. 358.

50. *Ibid.*, p. 370f.

51. Founded in 1872 by Charles Taze Russell in Allegeny, Pennsylvania, U.S.A. They have been known under various names, including in some countries, The International Bible Students Association. See Herbert Hewitt Stroup, *The Jehovah's Witnesses* (New York, The Columbia University Press, 1945) p. 2f.

52. Quoted from the official statement of belief that appears regularly in *The Watch Tower*, official publication of the Witnesses. Quoted by Stroup, *op. cit.*, p. 139. For a brief, but fuller, account of this conception, see the excerpt from the decision in an Appellate Court of South Africa, quoted in Stroup, *op. cit.*, p. 140f.

53. See *Ibid.*, p. 147 and 166.

54. *Ibid.*, p. 165f.

55. Marion Denman Frankfurter and Gardner Jackson, Editors, *The Letters of Sacco and Vanzetti* (New York, The Vanguard Press, 1930) p. 3 and 78.

56. *Ibid.*, p. 404.

57. *Ibid.*, p. 370f.

58. In a letter to Clarence Marsh Case, quoted in Case, *op. cit.*, p. 261f.

59. Case, *op. cit.*, p. 261.

60. See, for example, Tom Tippett., *When Southern Labour Stirs* (New York, Jonathan Cape and Harrison Smith, 1931) xvi, 341 p.; John Steuben, *Strike Strategy* (New York, Gaer Associates, Inc., 1950) 320 p.

61. See, for example, Harry W. Laidler, *Boycotts and the Labour Struggle: Economic and Legal Aspects* (New York, John Lane Co., 1918) p. 7-166.

62. See, for example, Arthur Griffith, *The Resurrection of Hungary: A Parallel for Ireland*, Third Edition (Dublin, Whelan and Son, 1918) p. ix-xxxii, 1-95; A. Fenner Brockway, *Non-cooperation in Other Lands* (Madras, Tagore & Co., 1921) p. 1-24; Theodore Paullin, *Introduction to Nonviolence* (Philadelphia, Penn., Pacifist Research Bureau, 1944) p. 16, cites also A. J. P. Taylor, *The Hapsburg Monarchy, 1815-1918* (London, Macmillan, 1941) p. 101-151.

63. See for example, Brockway, *op. cit.*, p. 25-39; Charles Frederic Mullett, *The British Empire* (New York, Henry Holt & Co., 1938) p. 610-627.

64. See the *Information Bulletin of the International Commission Against Concentration Camp Practices* (Brussels), No. 4, August-November 1955. Paul Barton (*ibid.*) reports that the situation of political prisoners in the Soviet Union has been "greatly eased", partly as a result of general reforms, says Barton, but, "the conscious and systematic action of the political prisoners, particularly of their leaders, is largely responsible". The 1953 strike at Vorkuta is classified under "peaceful resistance" because of the close association of religious paci-

fists (the *Monashki*) with that particular struggle.

65. See, for example, Aumunsen, Bjornstad, Homboe, Pedersen and Norum (Editors), *Kirkenesferda 1942* (Oslo, J. W. Cappelens Forlag, 1946) 464 p., and Sharp, "Kirkenes Journey" (series), *Peace News*, 31 January to 11 April 1958, reprinted as *Tyranny Could Not Quell Them* (London, Housemans Bookshop, 1959). Pacifists were also associated with this teachers' struggle, but not in such a way as to permeate into the struggle an aura of the moral superiority of nonviolent over violent methods of resistance, or in sufficient numbers as to warrant its classification under "peaceful resistance".

66. See, for example, "Attack on Conscience", *Time*, 18 February 1957, p. 13-16; Dr Martin Luther King, "Our Strúggle", *Liberation* (New York), April 1956, p. 3-6;—, "We Are Still Walking", *ibid.*, December 1956, p. 6-9; Dr Homer Jack, "U.S. Negroes in Mass Protest", *Peace News*, 23 March 1956, p. 1;—, "Still Walking to Freedom", *ibid.*, 21 December 1956, p. 1; Dr Martin Luther King, *Stride Toward Freedom; The Montgomery Story* (New York, Harpers, 1958) 230 p.

67. For futher discussion of the "nonviolence of the weak" and the "nonviolence of the brave", see, for example, Gopi Nath Dhawan, *The Political Philosophy of Mahatma Gandhi* (Bombay, The Popular Book Depot, 1945) p. 67f.; Nirmal Kumar Bose, *Selections From Gandhi* (Ahmedabad, Navajivan Publishing House, 1948) p. 123f.; and various passages in Gandhi, *Nonviolence in Peace and War* (Ahmedabad, Navajivan Publishing House, 1948 and 1949) Vol. I, 512 p., and Vol. II, xvi, 403 p.

68. In his later years Gandhi sometimes called this "nonviolence of the weak" by the term "passive resistance". For example, in July 1947, Gandhi said: ". . . our nonviolence was of the weak. But the weak of heart could not claim to represent any nonviolence at all. The proper term was passive resistance" (*ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 272). Two factors, however, cause the writer to classify these campaigns under "peaceful resistance" rather than "passive resistance": the degree of activity in these struggles and the degree to which belief in the moral superiority of nonviolent methods permeated them. Gandhi, February 1946: ". . . if the truth is told as it must be, our nonviolent action has been half-hearted. Many have preached nonviolent action through the lips while harbouring violence in the breast . . ."(*ibid.*, p. 30). Gandhi, December 1947 (summary of a post-prayer address): "He had admitted that it was not nonviolence of the brave that India had practised. But whatever it was, it had enabled a mighty nation of forty crores [400,000,000] to shake off the foreign yoke without bloodshed. It was the freedom of India that had brought freedom to Burma and Ceylon. A nation that had won freedom without the force of arms should be able to keep it too without the force of arms" (*ibid.*, p. 340).

69. See Mahadev Desai, *The Story of Bardoli* (Ahmedabad, Navajivan Publishing House, 1929) ix, 363 p.

70. See, for example, Louis Fischer, *The Life of Mahatma Gandhi* (New York, Harper and Brothers, 1950) p. 262-275; D. G. Tendulkar, *Mahatma: Life of Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi* (Bombay, Vithalbhai K. Jhaveri and

D.G. Tendulkar, 1952) Vol. III, p. 1-93; Bhogaraju Pattabhi Sitaramayya, *The History of the Indian National Congress* (Madras, The Working Committee of the Congress, 1935) Vol. I, xii, 1038 p.

71. See Leo Kuper, *Passive Resistance in South Africa* (London, Jonathan Cape, 1956) 256 p.

72. See Bart. de Ligt, *The Conquest of Violence* (New York, E.P. Dutton & Co., 1938) p. 149-153; Brockway, *op. cit.*, p. 40-70; F.A. McKenzie, *Korea's Fight for Freedom* (London, Simpkin, Marshal, 1920) 320 p.; Henry Chung, *The Case of Korea* (London, Allen and Unwin, 1922) 367 p.

73. See de Ligt, *op. cit.*, p. 147-153; de Ligt cites further references on p. 149 and 153.

74. For an account of this strike organized by the combined efforts of Leninist revolutionaries, *Monashkis* (religious pacifists) and anarchists, see Brigitte Gerland, "My Life in Stalin's Prison Camps", *The Militant* (New York), 17 January-7 March 1955, Vol. XIX, Nos. 3 to 10. For accounts of contrasting strikes in other camps in which the *Monashki* did not play a major role, see *Information Bulletin of the International Commission Against Concentration Camp Practices*, No. 4, August-November 1955.

75. See, for example, Shingo Shibata, "Japanese Air Base Defiance Campaign" *Peace News*, 26 October 1956, p. 1; "10,000 Stop Air-Base Extension Plan", *ibid.*, 1 March 1957, p. 3.

76. "*Satyagraha*" here refers to the campaign with nonviolent methods, as this has been widely known as the Vykom *Satyagraha*. rather than to Gandhi's over-all philosophy. See footnote 82.

77. See Krishnalal Shridharani, *War Without Violence: A Study of Gandhi's Method and its Accomplishments* (New York, Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1939) p. 89-92; Richard Gregg, *The Power of Nonviolence* (New York, Fellowship Publications, 1935) p. 26-28; Ranganath R. Diwakar, *Satyagraha: Its Technique and History* (Bombay, Hind Kitab Publishers, 1946) p. 115-117.

78. See "And No Birds Sing", *Time*, 15 January 1951, p. 30.

79. See George Houser, *Erasing the Colour Line*, Rev. Ed. (New York, Congress of Racial Equality); *CORE Action Discipline*, *CORE Statement of Purpose*, and *What is CORE?* (New York, Congress of Racial Equality, n.d.).

80. See, for example, Alan Lovell, "The Challenge of North Pickenham", *Peace News*, 26 December 1958, p. 1.

81. In India the term satyagrahi has been used both to describe the person believing in satyagraha as a matter of principle, and those persons participating in the resistance campaigns who were acting under a temporary discipline. Likewise, the term satyagraha has been used both to describe Gandhi's full belief system, and to describe resistance movements which he led or are more or less patterned after the methods he used and advocated. This ambiguity in the use of these terms may be too deeply rooted in Indian literature to be corrected, but the writer suggests that in future analysis elsewhere, it might facilitate clarity if the term satyagrahi were restricted to those sharing the belief system, and the term "civil resister" used to describe those participating in campaigns under a temporary nonviolent discipline. Likewise, satyagraha

might be used to describe campaigns involving "civil resisters". Dr Joan Bondurant (in her book, *Conquest of Violence: The Gandhian Philosophy of Conflict*, Princeton, New Jersey, Princeton University Press, 1958) has suggested instead that the term satyagraha be used to describe those types of nonviolent resistance which have certain qualities, especially consideration for the opponent as an individual. Without desiring to impose a solution to the terminological confusion, the present writer expresses the hope that Dr Bondurant's, his, and others' suggested solutions will be considered in order that the confusion may be ended.

82. Discussion of resistance movements led by satyagrahis with participation of others under a temporary discipline of nonviolent behaviour is discussed above under the heading "peaceful resistance".

83. Dhawan, *op. cit.*, p. 67f.

84. For a fuller discussion of Gandhi's philosophy and program, see, for example, Diwakar, *op. cit.*, xxiii, 202 p.; Gopi Nath Dhawan, *The Political Philosophy of Mahatma Gandhi*, (Ahmedabad, Navajivan Publishing House, 1951) Sec. Rev. Ed., vii, 407 p.; Nirmal Kumar Bose, *Studies in Gandhism* (Calcutta, Indian Associated Publishing Co., Inc., 1947) Sec. Ed., 354 p.; Gandhi, *The Constructive Program* (Ahmedabad, Navajivan, 1948) 32 p.;—, *Nonviolence in Peace and War*, Vols. I and II;—*Satyagraha* (Ahmedabad, Navajivan, 1951) xv, 406 p.; Krishnalal Shridharani, *op. cit.*; Louis Fischer, *The Life of Mahatma Gandhi* (New York, Harper and Bros, 1950) 558 p.; Gandhi, *All Men Are Brothers: Life and Thoughts of Mahatma Gandhi as Told in His Own Words* (Paris, UNESCO, 1958) xvi, 196 p.

85. An exception to this fourth aspect is Vinoba Bhave who favours "gentler" forms of nonviolence than those used by Gandhi in the Indian independence struggles.

86. Clarence Marsh Case (*Nonviolent Coercion: A Study in Methods of Social Pressure*, New York, The Century Co., 1923, p. 277-280) describes the beginnings of the synthesizing of the religious pacifist and the social radical approaches as early as World War I in the United States, although it is clear that this process has become socially significant only since 1945.

87. See various issues of *Chu Lieu (Main Current)*, issued from Kowloon by the Chulieu Society, Professor Lo Meng Tze, Chmn.

88. See Nikolaus Koch, *Die Moderne Revolution: Gedanken der Gewaltfreien Selbsthilfe des Deutschen Volkes* (Tubingen/Frankfurt, The Author, 1951) 135 p.

89. Examples of the developing thought in the nonviolent revolutionary approach in the United States, India and England are offered below.

90. An important step in this synthesis was made in the United States during World War II as religious pacifists and non-religious social radicals—finding themselves thrown together in conscientious-objector camps and prisons—began to expand their thinking and convictions beyond the previous limits recognised by these groups. A writer in the journal *Manas* comments on this development ("The New Men", *Manas*, (Los Angeles) 28 March 1956, Vol. IX, No. 13, p. 7).

91. Some would view nonviolent revolution as an application of *satyagraha*

to a new historical situation. Gandhi's later thinking included an emphasis on radical social, economic and political changes. For example, in June 1942, Gandhi said that in a free India, "The peasants would take the land. We would not have to tell them to take it" (Louis Fischer, *A Week With Gandhi*, New York, Duell, Sloan and Pearce, 1942, p. 54). Gandhi, May 1947: "There can be no Ramarajya [Kingdom of God] in the present state of iniquitous inequalities in which a few roll in riches and the masses do not get even enough to eat" (Gandhi, *Nonviolence in Peace and War*, Vol. II, p. 255.) Gandhi, 1945: ". . . if we have democratic *Svaraj* [Self-rule]. . . the *Kisans* [peasants] must hold power in all its phases, including political power" (Bose, *Studies in Gandhism*, p. 79.)

92. Or other combinations of these, as pacifists and social revolutionaries, or satyagrahis and social revolutionaries. Pacifists in such cases are likely to be familiar with the methods of nonviolent resistance and direct action.

93. Scott, "An Appeal to Reason", *Peace News*, 14 March 1958, p. 6.

94. Quoted by Donald Calhoun, "The Nonviolent Revolutionists", *Politics* (New York), Vol. 3, April 1946, p. 118-119.

95. Muste, "Build the Nonviolent Revolutionary Movement—Now" (mimeo.) 7 p., New York, The Author, 1947 (?).

96. Muste, "Proposed Manifesto", *The Peacemaker* (Yellow Springs, Ohio), Special Supplement, 15 January 1950, p. 4.

97. Muste, "Problems of Nonviolent Revolution", *The Peacemaker*, 1 March 1952, p. 5-6.

98. Lohia, "Nonviolence and Revolution", *Peace News*, 26 April 1957, p. 2.

99. Gyan Chand, "Bhudan as a Social Revolution", *Gandhi Marg*, January 1958, p. 44-46.

SOME MAIN CHARACTERISTICS* OF THE TYPES OF GENERIC NONVIOLENCE

1. Attitudes to self and society	non-resistance	active reconciliation	moral resistance	selective NV	passive resistance	peaceful resistance	NV direct action	satyagraha	NV revolution
a. "other worldly"	yes	no	no	may be	no	no	no	no	no
b. "this worldly"	no	yes	yes	may be	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
c. concern with own "purity"	yes	yes	yes	may be	no	may be	may be	yes	may be
d. support *status quo* in society	no	no	no	no	may be	may be	may be	no	no
e. desire to effect a particular social change only	no	no	no	no	may be	may be	may be	no	no
f. desire to effect social reforms, not basic changes	no	may be	yes	no	may be	may be	may be	no	no
g. desire to effect social revolution, i.e. basic changes	no	may be	no	may be	may be	may be	may be	yes	yes
2. Attitudes to "evil"									
a. withdrawal from	yes	yes	yes	may be	may be	may be	may be	yes	may be
b. imperative to act against	no	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
3. Attitudes to violence (V) and nonviolence (NV)									
a. NV based on principle	yes	yes	yes	no	no	no	may be	yes	usually
b. NV based on expediency	no	no	no	no	yes	no	may be	no	no
c. NV based on mixed (a) and (b)	no	no	no	no	no	yes	may be	no	may be
d. NV regarded intrinsically good	yes	yes	yes	may be	no	yes	may be	yes	yes

---

* The characteristics attributed to each type are largely based upon the avowals of the respective groups; the section on "Attitudes Towards Opponents" thus refers to *avowed* attitudes towards opponents, for example.

	3. Attitudes to violence (V) and nonviolence (NV)	non-resis-tance	active recon-ciliation	moral resis-tance	selec-tive NV	passive resis-tance	peaceful resis-tance	NV direct action	satya-graha	NV revolu-tion
e.	NV regarded as a method	no	yes	yes	no	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
f.	NV as a method regarded as a full substitute for V	—	yes	yes	—	may be	yes	yes	yes	yes
g.	NV regarded as a method which may be used in association with V	—	no	no	—	may be	no	no	no	no
h.	personal V in general rejected	yes	yes	yes	no	no	no	no	yes	usually
i.	group V in general rejected	yes	yes	yes	no	no	no	no	yes	yes
j.	State V in general rejected	yes	may be	may be	no	no	no	no	yes	usually
k.	war in general rejected	yes	yes	yes	no	no	no	no	yes	yes
l.	only certain V rejected as a subsidiary effect of a nonpacifist conception	no	no	no	yes	no	no	no	no	no
m.	V regarded as more than physical V; e.g. hostile attitudes	yes	yes	may be	no	no	may be	may be	yes	yes
4.	**Attitudes towards opponents**									
a.	hatred	no	no	no	may be	may be	no	may be	no	no
b.	resentment	no	no	no	may be	may be	may be	may be	no	may be
c.	indifference	no	no	no	may be	may be	may be	may be	no	may be
d.	respect	may be	yes	yes	may be	may be	yes	may be	yes	yes
e.	goodwill	yes	yes	yes	may be	no	yes	may be	yes	yes
f.	love	yes	yes	yes	no	no	may be	may be	yes	may be
5.	**Implementation of the approach**									
a.	acts of "self-purification"	yes	yes	may be	may be	no	may be	may be	yes	may be
b.	personal way of living	yes	yes	yes	may be	no	no	no	yes	may be
c.	persistent friendliness	yes	yes	yes	may be	no	may be	may be	yes	may be

5. **Implementation of the approach (continued)**	non-resistance	active reconciliation	moral resistance	selective NV	passive resistance	peaceful resistance	NV direct action	satyagraha	NV revolution
d. acts of mercy	yes	yes	yes	no	no	may be	no	yes	yes
e. exhortations	yes	yes	yes	yes	may be	may be	may be	may be	may be
f. "education"	no	may be	yes	may be	no	may be	no	yes	yes
g. verbal persuasion	yes	yes	yes	yes	may be	yes	may be	yes	yes
h. use of State to effect social change	no	may be	may be	may be	no	no	no	no	may be
i. use of non-State means to effect social change	no	yes	yes	may be	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
j. "constructive program"	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	yes	may be
k. passive forms of NV resistance	rarely	yes	yes	may be	yes	yes	no	yes	yes
l. active forms of NVR and direct action (DA)	no	may be	may be	may be	no	may be	yes	yes	yes
m. strategy in the NVR-DA	no	no	rarely	no	rarely	may be	yes	yes	yes

6. Mechanisms of social change

a. persuasion-conversion, leading to policy change	—	yes	yes	may be	no	yes	yes	yes	yes
b. NVR-DA etc. to create new social situation requiring opponent to reconsider attitudes etc., leading to policy change	—	may be	may be	no	no	may be	may be	yes	may be
c. attempting persuasion etc. but use NVR-DA to force policy change whether or not attitudes first changed	—	no	may be	may be	may be	may be	may be	?	may be
d. no persuasion etc., NVR-DA to force policy change	—	no	no	may be	may be	no	may be	no	no

NOTES ON THE THEORY OF NONVIOLENCE

William Robert Miller

How many of the books and articles that have been published concerning pacifism and nonviolence are without a very considerable degree of propagandistic, apologetic material? Author after author is concerned to provide a "basis" for pacifism or for nonviolence—and very often this is provided in something approaching a casuistical style that varies from one author to the next. A very interesting paper could be written, dealing with nothing else than the ideological (and theological) varieties themselves. Perhaps the reason is that almost the only writers in this field have a very impelling commitment to their subject which makes them tend to argue for it and erect defences against criticisms of it. The few who are not in this position are usually counter-ideologues, whose only concern is to debunk nonviolence or pacifism from the standpoint of another ideology to which they likewise are committed. There is little if any objective and disinterested research, devoted to presenting the whole picture and seriously analyzing the successes or failures of historic instances of nonviolence or pacifism or debating theoretical points. (Hebrews 6:1 is relevant to this matter: "Therefore let us leave the elementary doctrines of Christ and go on to maturity, not laying again a foundation of repentance from dead works and of faith towards God". The context of this passage is set by the preceding verses, 5:11-14, which have to do with the unreadiness of some Christians to assume leadership: "At a time when you should be teaching others", paraphrases J.B. Phillips, "you need teachers yourselves to repeat to you the ABC of God's revelation to men".) Frequently this seems to be the case with those who espouse pacifism and nonviolence; they tirelessly cover and recover the same elementary foundations in the same uncritical frame of mind. In the authors themselves there is frequently an unwillingness to engage in the necessary intellectual conflict with their co-thinkers which might clarify issues and raise important problems for solution. Consequently the issues are muddied and the problems glossed over in an attitude of charitableness that might better be reserved for the critics of pacifism and nonviolence. These latter are seldom accorded the kindly respect shown to the co-thinker, but are rudely dismissed as obstacles to the onward march of truth. But authentic maturity will be attained only as we learn to relax in the fundamental presuppositions of our faith and entertain theoretical doubts and assume the role of a devil's advocate who is more than a straw man. It is so easy for us to discover the rationalizations and ideological and psychological and motivational distortions in our opponent's thinking, and so hard to see these in ourselves; and it is likewise hard for us to recognize, concede and come meaningfully to grips with the solid criticisms that confront us.

In a letter published in *Harijan*, 7 December 1947, Gandhi says: "Europe mistook the bold and brave resistance full of wisdom by Jesus of Nazareth for passive resistance, as if it was of the weak. . . . Has not the West paid heavily in regarding Jesus as a Passive Resister?" Gandhi is here making a distinction between passive resistance and nonviolent resistance which, it seems to me, clouds the issue with emotion. Taking "nonviolence" or ahimsa as the generic term, I think it is possible to discern at least three types of action compatible with this attitude: (1) nonresistance; (2) passive resistance; and (3) nonviolent action.

The plain meaning of the words is there if we would only take elementary care with their philological components. Resistance, in the usual sense, simply means to withstand, oppose, stand firm against something, to block it or push it back. The

Latin root components are *re-*(back) and *sistere*, the causative of *stare* (to stand). This word includes the whole gamut of possible (and impossible) methods of resistance, which remain to be stated. Resistance can be real or false, mental or physical, pugilistic or armed, civil or military, violent or nonviolent—and this list by no means exhausts the possible qualifying adjectives that may be applied. Non-resistance is, clearly, the absence of all these—unless, as is frequently the case with negations, only a certain class of connotations is meant to be excluded. As customarily used, "non-resistance" refers to overt actions. He who practises non-resistance in this sense may very well oppose an adversary in his will and spirit, but does not present any overt obstacle to the action to which resistance would be a possible response. It might be pertinent here to ask: how does non-resistance differ from acquiescence or collaboration? The distinction lies in the connotation: the non-resister may well acquiesce in the action that is being done, but it is not a willing acquiescence. "Do not resist evil" does not mean, "Be complacent when evil is done", though it could mean, "Keep your resistance to yourself; let it remain unacted and restricted to the spiritual realm". It cannot ethically mean to give tacit endorsement to evil. "Non-resistance" therefore is an ambiguous term which carries within itself a contradiction of meanings that must be kept in fragile balance. Part, at least, of this ambiguity will be resolved at the linguistic level if we observe the force of the prefix "non" as contrasted with "un". To be *non*-resistant implies a purposiveness that does not apply to being *un*-resistant. Parenthetically, we should note that different languages have different structures and the manner in which such distinctions are made will vary according to the language.[1]

"Passive resistance" is perhaps a better word, a less ambiguous word for what is implied by the connotative use of the word "non-resistance". And yet because of the currency of "non-resistance", it has acquired its own connotations. The noun is positive and denotes action of some kind. How can an action be "passive"? In a broad sense, "non-resistance" could mean running away or otherwise evading the conflict implied in resistance of any kind. (Perhaps such action could be designated "unresistance".) Even so, this could be a form of resistance if it thereby thwarts or frustrates the action that has been presented. In fine, the distinguishing characteristic of non-resistance must be that it does not attempt to thwart the action itself. Jesus was nonresistant when he was sentenced to death, and his non-resistance is supremely evident in his "acquiescence" in the suffering he endured on the cross. He did not seek to aviod the consequences of the evil actions of his persecutors, and indeed entered death with forgiveness for them, which says something profound about the nature of a non-resistance which is not an end in itself but a corollary to agapaic love. That is, a further connotation is here introduced—we might speak of "redemptive non-resistance" or "loving non-resistance" or "Christian non-resistance". There is a similar, though not identical, implication in the Hindu concept of ahimsa, or non-harm, considered in all its aspects but with particular emphasis on the spiritual. To speak of "embittered non-resistance" or "hateful non-resistance" is to suggest the absurdity of omitting the spiritual connotations derived from the Gospel and from the Hindu doctrines. At the same time, let us not be too quick to suppose that it is impossible for non-resistance to be corrupted by unredemptive, unloving or un-Christian attitudes. There is no type of social or personal relation which cannot be emptied of spiritual content and rendered demoniac. Even the best of them can be perverted through divorcement from the divine spirit that breathes life into them. Gene Sharp has attempted a typology of nonviolence which is in many ways useful if somewhat speculative.[2] He lists nine separate types of "generic nonviolence", in order of "increasing activity", beginning with non-resistance and ending with "nonviolent revolution". Unfortunately, the nature of activity is unspecified—the term itself is perhaps too broad—but what is neglected most crucially, it seems to me, is the dimension of depth. In certain situations, non-resistance, embraced in spirit and in truth, may count for more, both in principle and in a strategic sense, than a sweeping nonviolent revolution that may be shallow and demoniac. To the extent that his categories are themselves valid, they beg for a more than unilinear treatment and need to be seen in the light of each of several other factors: stability, tactical adaptability, spiritual depth, social velocity, chances of organic growth, and relevance to a given existential situation.

What, then, is "passive resistance"? Surely it must be a form of action which is not overt in the way it opposes. It seeks to block the action in some way short of actively opposing it. Paradoxically, it may be a form of running away from the conflict which does not let the initial action continue unchanged. If non-resistance means remaining in the situation and yielding to its demands, passive resistance must mean thwarting these demands by altering the situation in some way, either within it or by withdrawal.

Passive resistance is likely to be defensive in both its tactics and its strategy, and to involve forms of non-cooperation that embarrass rather than coerce. It means directly altering one's own behaviour but not directly impeding that of the opponent. If non-resistance "goes along with" the opponent, absorbing the latter's aggression and offering no counteraction, passive resistance is a way that refuses to go along with the opponent but chooses routes of action which tactically disengage the resister from the direct point of conflict. It may overtly acquiesce in the opponent's terms, but its strategic effect is so to change the terms of the conflict that the opponent, for his own reasons and not because of any overt impediment, is led to initiate change. The boycott or withdrawal of patronage, the walk-out aspect of a strike—these are types of passive resistance. In these actions, the resister simply removes himself from engagement with his opponent at the point where the opponent relies upon the resister's reciprocal action to complete his own action. A factory cannot produce goods without the action of its workers. If they cease their productive action, the management of the factory is deprived of an indispensable element in the process of production. If bus riders passively refuse to ride buses, the buses will go empty and the bus company's revenues will be curtailed in proportion to the effectiveness of the boycott. The next step is up to the factory or the bus company, which must either come to terms with the resisters or replace them or force them to come back. But it must do *something* to regain control of the situation.

The Montgomery bus boycott is an example of passive resistance, and a famous one. Unfortunately it is, properly considered, an unsuccessful example, since the boycott was brought to a conclusion by a court decision which had nothing to do with the boycott itself.[3]

Passive resistance is a form of resistance which is nonviolent, and for this reason it is often used interchangeably with "nonviolent resistance". But not all kinds of nonviolent resistance are passive. If we said "active resistance", we would make clear the distinction of "active" versus "passive", but would thereby reopen the question of violence which is ruled out in the term "passive". Therefore, "nonviolent resistance" connotes a type of conduct which is active as nonviolent. In this, the resister seeks directly to thwart his opponent's conduct by his own, and this implies offensive tactics. A tactic of nonviolent action in the Montgomery situation, for example, would have been for the Negroes to have taken seats reserved for whites on the buses. But is this really "resistance"? There is so much of a positive, assertive character in this action that it raises a question about the appropriateness of the word "resistance" in this context. This question has to do with a difference between strategy and tactics. In military affairs, offensive tactics may be employed as subordinate parts of a strategy of withdrawal, with one unit advancing against enemy positions in order to facilitate the retreat of other units. Similarly, a tactical withdrawal may be a necessary part of a strategic advance. These are matters of technique which are separate from the issues of the conflict, though they undoubtedly have their moral aspect, their interior questions of economy of means, military ethics and so forth. Likewise with nonviolence. Nonviolent "resistance" is morally a combat *against* evil, but it is also morally *for* good. Both resistance and affirmation are modes of the same kind of action in tactics and strategy, and are defined largely by the extent of opposition such action encounters. The same action may be tactically resistant and strategically affirmative or vice versa. Since "resist" implies response to a prior or present action, when such action is absent, we cannot speak of resistance—but there are certainly cases in which action can be initiated which is nonviolent and which, evoking a hostile response, will become tactically resistant.

Is Nonviolence "Christian"?

Some exponents of nonviolence make the claim that it is "the way of the Cross", while its opponents frequently point out: (a) that in the personal love-ethic of Jesus, as demonstrated in his teachings (especially the Sermon on the Mount), the standard is not resistance of any kind but self-sacrificing non-resistance; and (b) that this love-ethic is inapplicable to society, so that types of coercion must be responsibly used by Christians to whom are entrusted the welfare of society. The dichotomy thus described is between absolutism, Utopianism, perfectionism, etc. on the one hand, and on the other hand, relativism, relevance, realism, etc. More specifically, the split is characterized by the former's insistence upon Christ as the norm to which all things are to be subordinated, whatever the cost and with the consolation that one's conduct is good in the sight of God and in the "long run" of history, even when its immediate viability is the indispensable criterion of action, even if this means the deferment of efforts at Christlike conduct in society to the unforeseeable future or to "the end of history". In between these extremes there is room, I think, for a recognition of the fact that nonviolence is a relativization or adulteration of Gospel non-resistance which is, in many instances at least, viable in the social order. That is, nonviolence is not a perfect expression of the Christian love-ethic but more closely approximates it than violence does. The Christian who absolutely rejects violence may readily avail himself of nonviolent methods of coercion and persuasion, finding in them a context in which to work for a greater expression of redemptive and reconciling love. The relativist or realist, who may be willing and ready to use violence for the same redemptive purposes (a motive too little appreciated by his critics, who often see its failure in practice), may also avail himself of nonviolence as one of several varieties of action that are open to him—and one which, other things being equal, is to be preferred for its greater compatibility with the teachings of Jesus. After all, it would be a perverse and wholly un-Christian kind of "realism" which could insist that armed force is always the preferable means for the solution of social conflict.

Nonviolence and Relevance

There is a certain interpenetration of the two approaches to nonviolence indicated above that is reflected in the interior problems of each. Here I want to consider how this affects the person who embraces nonviolence from the viewpiont of a prior commitment to abstain from violence. There is a temptation to think of nonviolence as a panacea (and for the realist there is the temptation to reject it as this and nothing more) which, if applied to any situation, is sure to bring the desired solution. But it is possible (and I think important and necessary) to reject this view as wishful thinking—without necessarily therefore rejecting nonviolence as a commitment. There are two distinct questions involved here. The first is: shall I be nonviolent in all circumstances? This is a question of personal commitment, and the possible answers are yes or no. The second is: is nonviolent action viable in all circumstances? The answer here has to do with results; it is not a subjective but an objective question, and the answer has to do with facts rather than will or intention. I may decide, in a given situation, to act in a certain way because of a faith or presupposition that this is the only right or honourable way to act. What constitutes effective, consequential action at that moment is another matter. The realist is also affected, if less noticeably, by this. A soldier who may have no compunctions about killing, may hold off from a certain kind of killing (e.g., torture, killing unarmed civilians) which might effect the solution to his problem but at a moral cost which transcends (or at least morally blocks) any gain that might be perceived.

Moreover, some types of action, whether violent or nonviolent, may have so little visible chance of success that they are virtually suicidal and yet are not necessarily contemptible for that reason On the contrary, we admire the valiant man who risks certain death for the sake of his beliefs—particularly if we share those beliefs, but even if we are at enmity with him. For this very reason we despise the man who proposes a risky course of action and personally flinches from the consequences—the man who counsels heroism and martyrdom for others but seeks safety for himself. And for the same reason we lack respect for the man who so little values his life or his cause that he will vaingloriously dispose of it to no purpose either of witness or of achievement. Sometimes our attitude may be complex: we can appreciate the personal courage of the men who died in the battle of the Little Big Horn, at the Alamo or at San Juan Hill or in the charge of the Light Brigade—while reflecting that in history these were the wrong places and the wrong causes at which and for which to give one's life—all imperialist ventures. Our criteria of judgement are not unilateral unless our concern is unilaterally for nonviolence at all costs, courage at all costs, etc.

It is, after all, this elevation of a partial value to the position of absolute supremacy which is the offence called idolatry. The demands of the Christian faith are by no means fulfilled in the mere abstention from violence, even if this is taken to be a cardinal and indispensable element of it—and the same is true if one takes courage or freedom or truth or any other God-given value and sets it up as a god in itself. What kind of love is it that is unconcerned for the justice it has to fulfil and transcend? Or that affirms fellowship with the enslaved without moving to free them? Or that embraces truth in the abstract but shrinks from it in the concrete?

It is because none of these separate absolutes will suffice as faithful service to God that dilemmas arise for even the most devout Christian—and indeed can be avoided only by those whose faith is in some way defective. The Christian way is a dynamic of inner attitude and outward action. "Good works" without the energizing force of faith are "dead"—they can at best produce only an illusion of redemption. On the other hand, a perhaps more subtle question: what is the value of faithful intentions that find no means of access to the world and merely exist in the bosom of the individual? These are the intentions that wait for the propitious moment that never comes—the intentions with which the "road to hell" is paved. For the Christian life consists in the deepening of the well-springs of action, not their substitution by purely private states of mind. Yet there is sufficient ambiguity in men's actions; and in saints like Paul of Tarsus and Francesco d'Assisi there is enough of that ambiguity to require the sustenance of God's grace—and in our own times we can find faults in such men as Bonhoffer and Gandhi to prove that sainthood is not divinity.

It may bear repetition that the Christian who is committed to nonviolence has not thereby fulfilled the demands of his faith. In a sense, these demands are so hard and so high that no Christian nor any mortal man can fulfil them. But humanly speaking, within the bounds of what you or I may do by God's grace, there is at least a tempo we can reach, a limit of usable strength, beyond the realm of half-heartedness. Man cannot legitimately aspire to be God, but he can often extend and deepen his ways of serving Him in faithful discipleship. Violence is only one of the evils in the world, and the violence of war is only one of the forms of violence. The task of the Christian is not only to abstain from violence but to overcome it. The only Christian justification for the "realist's" use of violence is his hope of thereby staving off and eventually overcoming another kind of violence or evil which he considers worse—and it is in this that his "relativism" consists, and on the ambiguities of which he is so frequently impaled, since it is often problematical to determine which violence is worse, that which one seeks to counter or that which one uses (and the temptation, of course, is to minimize the latter).

This much is clear, then. Nonviolence cannot be Christianly used to dodge responsibility; its God-given function is not evasive but redemptive. The exponent of nonviolence cannot just "mind his own business" and fulfil his faith merely by engaging in nonviolence when violence happens to cross his path. Like every aspect of Christian faith, preachment has to be rooted in practice and practice in the world—not just the world that impinges upon our everyday activities and not just the remote world of nations and continents, but the world as a structure of human community in all its ramifications. We do not fulfil our faith either by isolated acts of human kindness toward individuals or by "keeping informed" about international affairs, "supporting the UN", etc., though each of these has its place. There is great merit in social action which involves the individual Christian with numbers of people in ways that ask more of him than a monetary contribution, for community is one of the dimensions of Christian faith. This, incidentally, is a characteristic of nonviolent action.

But let us return to the earlier question of nonviolence as a panacea, having made it clear that nonviolence must be meshed with concern for injustice, that it must be accompanied by an affirmation of love that is not abstract but partaking of community concern. Must it then succeed in order to be valid? If it fails, must its failure invariably be attributed to unfavourable circumstances? I think there must be situations in which nonviolence is bound to fail and yet has an intrinsic value that may be socially irrelevant, but which still stands in the personal relation of a man to his comrades and to his God. Situations are bound to arise in which one's witness is wholly lost to the world, yet it is not lost to God. In a Nazi concentration camp a man perished. He would still have perished no matter what he did, whether he bowed and scraped before his oppressors or whether he revolted in the effort to kill as he was being killed. No one knew of his action. Or if they did, perhaps they misinterpreted its intent in a dozen ways. Still, he himself knew and God knew, and in that private and holy relation he died true to his faith. Such a fate surely is not to be scorned, even if it is totally irrelevant to society, to history or to another human being, alive or dead. In the same category, though less absolute, is the man who could have helped another man only at the cost of his own faith. This is a delicate situation, and we must be careful not to prejudice it by injecting corollary suppositions. Suffice it to say that each of us can imagine some act so debasing that no situation could require it as the price of doing "good" to a fellow human being. I do not believe it is necessary to examine further hypothetical situations to establish my point, that there are grounds besides social relevance for right conduct—in this case, nonviolence—that may or may not also be potentially relevant to other human beings.

What I want to insist upon is that actions have both personal and social meanings and value and while the two may be hard to disentangle in practice, it is necessary to distinguish them for purposes of understanding and evaluation.

The Scope of Nonviolence

The word "nonviolence" has both intended and possible meanings. The word is intended to represent types of conduct that are purposively lacking in violence. Within this meaning it is further desirable to distinguish between nonviolence of conduct, of attitude, of spirit, etc. There may be some inner ambiguity on these points which the word itself only potentially resolves. This interior range of meaning is a legitimate subject of debate, the *a priori* assumption being that nonviolence *per se* should (if it does not necessarily) imply the complete configuration of action, attitude, spirit, etc. But at the other extreme, the exterior boundary of meaning, it should be made clear that actions from which violence is gratuitously absent are not therefore "nonviolent". Many people in many situations prefer and often choose responses that do not involve violence. For lack of a better term, let us call this kind of action "unviolent" rather than "nonviolent". Sometimes in making distinctions between the two, in cases where motivation is not clear, we shall have to resort to empirical and arbitrary choice af words. But let us at least be clear beforehand that there are these two distinctly different types of action which are not violent.

Criteria of Success

How often have the participant in a nonviolent campaign pronounced their efforts a "success" because they received favourable publicity? Sometimes the latter may consist of nothing so much as a local newspaper's editorial defending their elementary constitutional liberties or commending their motives despite disapproval of the campaign itself. Or it may be that a passer-by smiled or gave a word of encouragement. By what criteria do these evidences of limited support or bare tolerance constitute *success* for the campaign? Nonviolence is based on "adherence to truth", by which is meant not only a transcendent metaphysical concept finally, as with Gandhi, coterminous with God, but also a very down-to-earth concern for factual accuracy, open dealing with the actual even when it is unpleasant. Among other things, adherence to truth must mean the absence of any trace of falsification, whether through exaggeration, warped or prejudicial assessment or reporting, excessive modesty or simply tireless inattention to details.

1. Herbert Read, in his *Anarchy and Order* (London: Faber, 1954), p.162 f., remarks on some of the philosophical consequences of the fact that the two English words "liberty" and "freedom" are both translated as the same word in French and German, respectively *liberte* and *Freiheit*, necessitating the use of qualifying adjectives to express the distinctions that inhere in the two English words. Part of our present problem no doubt derives from the difficulty of translating key terms of Christianity and Gandhism from the Hebrew, Aramaic, Greek, Sanskrit, Hindi, etc. and rendering them negotiable within a common vocabulary. This difficulty is compounded by the modern tendency to debase language for the sake of a supposed efficiency at the expense of natural varieties of meaning: e.g., the tendency to use "-ize" and "-ism" against the natural bent of language, whereby we get such bastard coinages as "specialism" in place of the more natural "speciality" etc. In German the distinction between "un" and "non" is expressed by the prefix "un" and affix "-los", offering possible distinctions of "*Ungewaltigkeit*" and "*Gewaltlosigkeit*"—neither of which would be precisely translatable as "nonviolence" or "ahimsa" but which would already possess innate differences of meaning that would lend themselves to connotative as well as denotative use. The same problem has to be worked out within the confines of each language.

2. See Gene Sharp: "A Study of the Meanings of Nonviolence", *supra*, p. 21-66.

3. This is not to deny the considerable contributory benefits and side-effects of the struggle, which created a new morale, developed courage and actively promoted community feeling among the Negroes of Montgomery, and also set in motion a series of events that were to have wide effects in a decisive and positive way throughout the South. But the fact remains that, in achieving its immediate objective, the bus boycott neither succeeded nor failed. The significance of this irony has so far been overshadowed by subsequent events, and it is doubtful whether it will prove to have any historical significance.

NONVIOLENCE AS A POSITIVE CONCEPT

James E. Bristol

The believer in nonviolence shares with many others the goal of a decent, just and equitable society. He wants to see an end to injustice, tyranny, corruption, and the exploitation of men by their fellows. With others he is deeply concerned to establish peace in the world, but not a peace purchased at any price. He knows that the only peace that can endure and be worthy of the name is based on justice.

Among those who think of themselves as believers in nonviolence there are diverse points of view. Some use nonviolence only as a technique which might be discarded under other circumstances; some hold to nonviolence as a matter of principle, and for some it is an essential part of their religious faith. The only honest statement to make today is that I speak for myself, and out of my own convictions, and that while there are a goodly number whose thinking I reflect, there are certainly many others who would not be in agreement with the emphasis that I will express. Although by no means all who attempt to practise nonviolence are pacifists, a number are. Since I take the pacifist position myself, it may be less clumsy to use that term than to speak constantly about "the believer in nonviolence".

At his best the pacifist is not content with the *status quo*, even though for him the lines may have fallen into pleasant places.

He is sensitive to the poverty, the distress, and the abject misery in which millions of his fellowmen live, not only in Asia, Africa, and Latin America, but even in his own country, and in the very city in which he dwells. He realizes that, although overt violence comes vividly to the fore when desperate people take a situation into their own hands and blood runs in the streets, violence is in fact the daily lot of a staggering number of people. When in India some mothers throw their baby children down the village well because this is the most merciful action they can take in the blind alley of poverty in which they dwell, when in the United States thousands awake every morning to contemplate the indignities and insults to which they may be subjected that day, violence exists in all too real a fashion. Being deeply conscious of man's ever-present inhumanity to his fellow man, the pacifist in the company of many others is impatient for change; he is a revolutionary and a fighter, a builder and a constructive worker. He is determined not merely to do away with swords and spears, but to beat the "swords into plowshares", and the "spears into pruning hooks".

All over the world most people think that only two reactions are possible in the face of tyranny, aggression or injustice. Men and women can either use violent methods, can kill, torture, or engage in sabotage, or they can be cowardly and surrender. When it is suggested that without recourse to violence strong and forthright resistance may be offered, many people simply fail to see this as a third alternative. Instead they equate it with the second, still thinking of nonviolent resistance as the equivalent of surrender. I accompanied Dr and Mrs Martin Luther King during their tour of India in early 1959, and I vividly remember that a group of African students in Bombay to whom Dr King spoke about nonviolence argued that they would not surrender to the colonial powers, but would insist on winning their freedom. This is all the more noteworthy because Dr King was being hailed throughout India as the champion of freedom for people of colour all over the world. Yet even when he advocated nonviolence it was misunderstood to mean acquiescence in colonial subjugation.

The pacifist, however, strives to be closer in spirit to the soldier than to the coward, and sees far more of courage than of cowardice in the lives of such practitioners of nonviolence as Gandhi, Vinoba Bhave, Martin Luther King, Abbe Pierre and Danilo Dolci.

Such men reject violence because of a deeply held conviction that the employment of violence leads men and nations away from the decent society which is their goal. Wars fought to end war, though calling forth tremendous courage and immeasurable sacrifice, have led to more rather than to less war, nor have they made the world safe for freedom and democracy.

Even preparations for war tend to produce the same tragic results. The resources, energies, initiative and imagination needed to wage successfully the war on want, poverty and human misery are instead diverted to preparing ever more fantastic weapons of violence. Nor is this all; suspicion and distrust, hostility and fear grow apace, and the security that we so vainly seek to achieve by force of arms keeps constantly eluding us. Some fifteen years ago I heard it said that "as our military strength approaches infinity, our security approaches zero". True though that was in 1948, it is tragically much more so today. Despite the deep sincerity of our desires, it is simply impossible to move in two opposite directions at the same time. Short of the waging of war, preparedness leads us away from the creative handling of concrete problems that must be solved and from the achievement of trust and confidence that must be realized if we are to move in the direction of a world community and the development of a just and equitable social order for people in every part of the world.

As the pacifist reads history and learns that even highly-motivated revolutions have more than once eventuated in bloody tyrannies, he is driven to the conviction that there is an inexorable relationship between the methods used to achieve our goal and the goal itself when finally reached. He is driven to believe that the end is in fact the sum total of the means we use to reach it. The "law of the harvest" is not just a quaint phrase to be found in holy writ. We reap what we sow, and only what we sow and, for all our lofty desires and avowals of idealism, thorn bushes refuse to produce grapes, and thistles figs.

Nor is this all. Not only do violent methods betray us in our effort to reach a constructive goal, but in addition in a subtle and usually unrecognized fashion their user is transformed into the image and likeness of the very evil he was opposing. While outwardly he appears to be untouched and unchanged, his behaviour has actually become so brutalized that he has become the practitioner of the very callousness and brutality from which he was determined to rescue mankind. Admittedly the pacifist says No to violence, but only in order to say Yes to the building of a just and humane society.

Gandhi's emphasis was both on opposing the British Raj and on building a society that would make India worthy of her freedom. He led the famous "Salt March to the Sea" to make salt in defiance of the British tax laws and spent countless months in British jails, and at the same time he worked to end the caste system; he transformed the depised outcastes into "Harijans" (the children of God); he instituted the hand-spinning of thread and the hand-weaving of Khadi cloth; he improved sanitation, and he established an entirely new concept of "basic eduation" to meet the needs of Indian villagers.

Young Americans sit, or stand, or kneel in restaurants, stores, parks and churches in efforts to change the segregated policies practised there. Integrated groups board buses and enter terminals on "Freedom Rides" that challenge segregation. A small group of young people leave San Francisco in December 1960, determined to "walk" all the way to Moscow. Some of them indeed do walk the entire distance from San Francisco to New York, and from the Belgian coast to Moscow. The unilateral abandonment of the weapons of mass destruction and reliance upon nonviolence and friendliness instead are both urged in this country and "told to the Russians". Others man (in all) four boats and attempt to sail them into the forbidden nuclear testing zone in the Pacific, genuinely willing to lay down their own lives as a protest against the death-dealing and war-breeding practices of their government. At times in all these efforts civil disobedience to unjust and discriminatory laws and regulations is called for, even when this action leads to arrest and time in jail.

Such an approach when carried out in the best spirit of nonviolence has four important characteristics: (1) Participants fight tyranny, aggression, an evil system with all the vigour at their command, but they believe in the worth and dignity of their opponent and insist upon loving him even when he showers abuse or inflicts physical punishment upon them, yes, even when he kills them. (2) Participants try to bring about a change of attitude within their enemy; they strive to raise his sights, not to subdue, cripple, or kill him. (3) They take loss and suffering upon themselves. They do not inflict pain upon another, nor threaten him with pain. There is no warning of retaliation, massive or otherwise. It is important to bear in mind that nonviolent action does not mean the absence of violence, nor the absence of anguish and suffering, but that the agony involved is taken upon one's self and not visited upon an opponent. (4) Constructive work is undertaken wherever possible. Protest against injustice, against destructive systems and practices is not enough. The eradication of poverty, the building of cooperatives, the establishment of village industry, the improvement of educational facilities, these and similar efforts must be constantly entered into.

As with the use of violence, so the practice of nonviolence is fraught with risks and hazards. People the world over are conditioned to feel that violent methods guarantee protection whereas confidence in nonviolence is but a snare and a delusion. To the pacifist both ways appear to be risky; certainly he feels no God-given guarantee of succeess as he embarks upon a nonviolent course of action, but he would far rather run the risks of that approach because he believes that in so doing he is using methods which are in harmony with the under-girding purposes of the universe. The law of the harvest does operate, and since he is concerned for the welfare of his children and of his grand-children no less than for that of his contemporaries, he feels far more secure in gambling upon a nonviolent approach to the building of a just social order.

This may be hard to believe in a world where, except for the nonviolent efforts to end racial segregation in the South, there is very little to encourage the pacifist. In Africa a few years ago there was considerable interest in nonviolence among the leadership in the freedom movements; today it has almost disappeared. In South Africa several nonviolent efforts had achieved encouraging results, but the stern measures of the government have now convinced the African in that country that only violence will be effective. Even in India many staunch practitioners of nonviolence, who under Gandhi were heroic in their opposition to the British, have turned their backs upon a nonviolent approach as they face the twin enemies of China and Pakistan. I spent the last three weeks of 1962 in India and was privileged to engage in searching conversations with leaders of India, both within and without the government, men and women who had been close to Gandhi and had been deeply influenced by him. Although judgments differ, and not everyone supports the present Indian military build-up, it is unmistakably clear that we cannot look to India, as perhaps erroneously some of us did in the past, for our salvation. If we are to find a nonviolent solution to our most pressing and dangerous problems, we will have to find it for ourselves, which is probably exactly as it should be.

All over the world human beings appear to operate in their relationships with others, especially with other groups and nations, on three basic assumptions: (1) that the other person or nation is at fault; (2) that those at fault are moreover beyond the pale, at least for the time being not reacting and responding quite as other humans do; (3) that because the first two assumptions add up to the presence of an implacable enemy, we are therefore forced to abandon our moral and ethical insights, and go to any lengths, no matter how brutalized we may become in the process, in order to cope with this implacable opponent. We enter into a contest in which there are no rules or regulations, no holds, nor any excesses barred.

A nonviolent philosophy challenges these three assumptions fundamentally, believing: (1) that although others are by no means perefect, a part of the fault lies always within ourselves, and it is here and only here that we can hope to eliminate it; (2) that although we do recognize the brutality and barbarism of the actions of our enemy, no person nor collection of persons is ever beyond the pale, else they would have had to leave the human family which they cannot do; (3) that therefore there is no greater folly than to put aside our highest insights and enter into an open-ended commitment to be as brutal and as vicious as the enemy. Our means must be consistent with our ends. In point of fact, there is no way to peace; peace is the way, and it is only as we explore it, practise it, try to incarnate it, and if necessary lay down our lives for that way, that we shall some day reach the peace that all men seek.

It is folly to say that we cannot trust the Communists, that they are just plain no good, and that our only hope lies in threatening them to the point where they become prudent. Physical and material force is not the only power in this world. There is a power to friendliness and understanding, to practised brotherhood, to open confidence in others, to earnest efforts to remove exploitation and establish justice for our fellowmen. If there is one tragic fact that I have learned as I have moved about the world in recent years, it is that words have lost their meaning. For millions of people in Asia and Africa, in Latin America and in our own United States, the white man's love means, in practice, hate. His justice is exploitation; his freedom is tyranny, and his peace is always in reality war.

Nothing less then is required than that words become flesh and dwell among us, for only thus will men believe and trust, and hope again. To restore faith, to unloose what was once described by the word love, to enable the moral and spiritual forces of the universe to work through us, this is far and above the most important thing for any of us to do today. To break with violence, suspicion, and hatred in a world gone mad with these passions, to show in our lives, in our No as well as in our Yes that we trust and commit all that is most precious to us to those same moral and spiritual forces—nothing else is as important and necessary for us to do today. Were we to do so in sufficient numbers there might be established a rock upon which politicians and statesmen could build for the elimination of war and the realization of peace.

EXPERIMENTATION IN NONVIOLENCE: THE NEXT PHASE

William Robert Miller

Two incidents, one from India's agony of the Hindu-Muslim riots of 1948 and the other from the current struggle in the United States for civil rights, pose a problem for nonviolence which has wide implications. The first concerns a Gandhian cadre who died bravely at the hands of rioters. It matters little whether he was a Hindu or a Muslim; he was one and his assailants were the other; he endured their death-dealing blows without any gesture of retaliation. The episode is one of several that were reported, and the point made in each case was the bravery and steadfastness of the satyagrahi. The point I wish to raise here, however, is that in the incident to which I refer there was clearly a total absence of rapport between the satyagrahi and his attackers. Apparently, indeed, an important source of this man's spiritual strength, enabling him to die unflinchingly, was a sense of his own purity, his very pride in being a nonviolent man. So focussed were his thoughts on the rules of conduct that he was unable to affirm the bond of essential human unity with his assailants. His bravery was armoured with contempt which further inflamed rather than quenching his opponents' hostile feelings. In short, his conduct was moralistic rather than moral; he had fulfilled the letter of the rules but had neglected their spirit and intent.

The second incident was reported to me by a Negro civil-rights activist who was leading a nonviolent demonstration, when an undisciplined Negro mob began to form. White bystanders and police were also present, and a riot was clearly in the making. The police obviously did not know how to prevent violence, though in this case they wanted to. It quickly became evident to the nonviolent Negro leader that he must address the unruly masses, but he could not make himself heard above the tumult. Following the standard rules of nonviolent conduct—as outlined in Diwakar's *Satyagraha*, in my own recent *Nonviolence* and elsewhere—he approached the police captain who had an electrically amplified magaphone "bullhorn", explained that he was the leader of the demonstrators and asked politely for the use of the bullhorn. The officer ignored him—how did he know if he was really the leader, or whether a police captain should delegate his authority in this way? The Negro leader became angry, shouted at the captain: "You'd better give me that bullhorn, you stupid——, or there's going to be hell to pay"—and seizing the bullhorn from the startled officer's hand began addressing the crowd, which soon quietened and dispersed.

Conscious of his breach of the accepted rules in venting his anger, the Negro leader asked my opinion as a theorist, and we discussed the episode and its meaning at some length. The nub of it came to this, that he had been in other situations in which he knew that such an angry outburst would bring a hostile response—arrest, clubbing, perhaps shooting—and he was capable of curbing the impulse. But in the situation described above, he sensed rightly that such behaviour would enable him to take charge and calm the mob. There was a risk; he took it and was vindicated by the result. His anger was not motivated by hatred but by the desire to get through to the mob. Afterwards he had thereby won the respect of the police captain, who was so relieved by the speedy solution that he tacitly forgave and forgot the insult.

This is not an episode that I would want to offer anyone as a model; it presupposes a great deal of both insight and nerve as well as the seasoning of experience. Yet one cannot rebuke the leader. The shock of anger was undeniably effective, and certainly the leader would have been remiss if he had stuck to politeness while tension mounted and burst into violence. In its way, his was very much an "experiment with truth", albeit both riskier and more fruitful than the moralistic rote application of the rules which Gandhi distilled from his own experiments. Moreover, it illustrates something that is fundamental to experimentation. There is a sense in which experiments serve merely to test and validate a hypothesis or to confirm by demonstration the process or mechanics by which it works. How many hours must a psychology student spend in replicating today the classic experiments of Pavlov, Hull, Terman and Skinner. In this sense, every cadre learns his basic nonviolence by replicating the classic patterns of satyagraha on the model of Gandhi, Patel, Luthuli, King and others.

But there is also a point at which the advancement of knowledge requires the assertion of new, previously untested hypotheses or the re-exploration of those discarded by earlier pioneers. Perhaps there are new factors that were not formerly taken into account; perhaps the conditions under which a formerly unsuccessful venture was tried were unusual in some way. So the graduate student of psychology is drawn into a further dimension of inquiry—as must be the seasoned nonviolent cadre.

Floyd Dell, associate editor of the radical American magazine *The Masses*, wrote prophetically in 1916: "The theory of non-resistance is the prescientific phase of a new kind of knowledge, the knowledge—to put it vaguely—of relationships. Here is a field as yet unexplored save by the seers and the poets. Its laws are as capable of being discovered as those of astronomy or botany; and the practical application of this knowledge is capable of effecting far greater social changes than the invention of the steam engine. At present, however, we have only rhapsodies and maxims, the biography of an Oriental god—and a few contemporary anecdotes."

In the half-century since then, we have moved a long way from alchemy and wizardry toward chemistry and science. The word "nonviolence" did not even exist, and it would be decades before it even began to enter the intellectual vocabulary. The whole history of the great Indian swaraj movement under Gandhi had not even begun when Dell wrote. During that half-century occurred not only this and other historic events, but the first serious attempts at theory and interpretation and of research above the level of the edifying anecdote, bringing to light earlier historic episodes. The studies of Case, Ligt, Huxley, Gregg, Bondurant, Sharp, Galtung, Kuper, Naess and others in the West, of Gandhi, Diwakar, N.K. Bose, Shridharani, Bhave, Narayan and others in India—not always of the best quality, sometimes lapsing into idle fantasy, but in general building and growing—all of these have indeed lifted nonviolence from the prescientific phase and launched it as a matter worthy of the attention of the scientific mind. It can no longer be smirked at as the preoccupation of sentimentalists, fanatics or saints. As these lines are written, two hundred *unarmed* sailors of the U.S. Navy are on their way to Mississippi under orders from the President of the United States to act in the incredibly tense racial situation there. There is no telling, at this moment, what will happen next. But this much is obvious: such an action would not have been undertaken but for the examples arising from the past half-century of the maturation of nonviolence.

It is fitting, too, that Dell referred to "the knowledge of relationships", for this half-century has witnessed a parallel maturation in psychology and sociology which very recently have become closely interrelated with nonviolence. Corman, Choisy, Frankle, Bettelheim, Frank, Boulding, Lakey, Sibley are among those whose contributions have been most noteworthy, and it is precisely in this dimension that a large degree of further exploration needs to be done.

To be sure, there is a considerable field for historical research. According to Crane Brinton, a serious study of country chronicles in England could provide documentation for a historic tradition of unarmed peasant revolts and civil disobedience going back to medieval times. This is only one of many neglected and unexplored territories; another is the general history of religious non-resistance in the West, tracing its various forms and doctrinal contexts. It would be interesting to learn more, for instance, about the relationship of mysticism and humanism, orthodoxy and various heresies to nonviolence.

But even if this kind of information is brought to light, it remains to be interpreted and understood in terms of motivation and dynamics. So many of our ethical norms and valuations are rationalistic or traditional. Consider, for example, Gandhi's lifelong struggle within the tensions between reason and custom as he came to terms with the problem of varna. The step from untouchability to the designation of Harijan was a considerable one for a man and for a society, easier to grasp from outside the event or after it, yet the persistence of the problem and of others like it, such as race and class bias, attests to the inadequacy of our present resources to fulfil the mandate. We must at least question all the pat answers – it's just a question of bread, of education, of religious training, etc.—and acknowledge that much of what we do is done in ignorance of how or why or even to whom.

Except in the rarest cases, it is not a question of suspending or abandoning action because we don't know what we are doing. One of the prime lessons of satyagraha is the necessity of purposive action, whether to affirm or to resist or to construct. Fatalistic acquiescence is no kind of option. But as we act and commit ourselves, and as we observe the responses of others, we also need to strive towards a better understanding of the inner motives, latent possibilities, probable consequences. The chief task of the last fifty years has been to get our facts straight, to sort out the socio-historical from the merely anecdotal, to codify and classify the insights and precepts of the sages and pioneers. Other generations will have to repeat these tasks with variations, but the ground work has been done. A readier example would be hard to find than Diwakar's concise, tightly organized *Satyagraha*, which spares the reader the necessity of wandering endlessly through volumes of Gandhi's journalistic writings. It does not render the latter useless but provides the student with a structure or a compass. And, in turn, it makes possible the more expanded yet similarly structured study represented by Bondurant's *Conquest of Violence*. Each builds on the others, and the total result is extremely valuable. But of necessity it remains far from complete and some of the literature may even be misleading. As a case in point, Gregg's *The Power of Nonviolence* was the first book in the field which seriously attempted to provide a psychological foundation. Gregg's concept of "moral jiu-jitsu" still is largely cogent, yet in some respects it has been superseded by Maryse Choisy's post-Freudian conception of the same basic process, and many relatively minor aspects of Gregg's psychology have come to seem makeshift and obsolete in the thirty years since his book was first published. He is not in bad company; a good deal of Marx and Freud looks rather curious and quaint in retrospect, and we must remember that their wiser successors' wisdom is rooted in their heritage.

I think it is worth noting that sixteen years of development separates the two episodes mentioned at the beginning of this essay. The Negro leader had learned much that was not available to the Gandhian cadre, and indeed he had the opportunity of thinking at leisure and in broad perspective about the very situation in which the latter had to decide and act. But above all, the Negro leader knew that both he and the theoretical equipment of the movement had matured to the point at which new experimentation takes over from the preliminary replications.

Progress is not automatic, and new departures do not necessarily go forward or upward. I am making no sweeping claims here, only indicating a change which at least seems to reflect a growing concern with the content of the interpersonal encounter rather than a self-sufficient moral posture. The two men could have been both acting in 1948 or both in 1964—or in Vedic or Biblical times. But there is reason to think that their individual outlooks are symptomatic of a more widespread change. For at the same time, during the past decade or so, that important strides have been made in the study of nonviolence and in the development of existential psychology and other relevant interpretative disciplines, the worldwide nonviolent movement has been undergoing historic crises—the rise and collapse of the Committee of One Hundred in England, the defeat of the African National Congress in South Africa and the desperate turn represented by Poqo and Umkonte We Sizwe there, the impact of the China-India border clash on India's Gandhians, the turn towards fascism in Ghana, the rising voice of black particularism within the Negro community in the United States, the virtual abandonment of nonviolence by the newly emergent African republics, the apparently meteoric rise and fall of voluntaristic international Shanti Sena plans. Michael Scott, writing in a recent issue of *Twentieth Century*, voices the new mood as he assesses the failure of the Committe of One Hundred, which he helped to found. The mood is not one of renegacy or even of slackened commitment, but it is disillusioned in the sense that the high optimism of revolutionary romanticism has yielded to a self-critical realism. The time is past for making extravagant claims for "the method" and its efficacy. As recently as a decade ago, it was possible to think primarily of "defending" or "arguing for" the idea of nonviolence, and facts were regarded as bulwarks of evidence; whatever did not help to promote the idea tended to be shunted aside or rationalized away. There has scarcely ever been an idea under the sun that did not undergo this sort of infancy. Universal manhood suffrage, the Western working-class movement, the rights of women—each in turn has begun by proposing itself as virtually the definitive answer, the key to the good life and the Kingdom of God. And each has reached a point of equilibrium at which modesty and candour brought disillusionment and a new perspective—never, to be sure, without the danger of apostasy, when some of the most ardent devotees make a sharp about-face to repudiate "the God that failed".

There are such apostates of nonviolence today, but it is worth noting that most of them were never leaders, however intensely their emotions were committed to the cause; they have experienced an intellectual sense of betrayal, pivoted to a volatile temperament—not an existential *volte-face.* Michael Scott, speaking from the centre of existential commitment, thus articulates not only the crisis but also the undergirding equilibrium to which nonviolence has come. Paradoxically it is a crisis of success as well as of failure. To revert to an earlier analogy, it is possible to discuss the "crisis in physics" or the dilemma of the "two cultures" as posed by C.P. Snow without raising fundamental doubts about science as such. Nonviolence has reached such a point, and Scott and others, confident that nonviolence has proved itself feasible in history, are now putting aside yesterday's propagandistic zeal and are raising key questions about discipline, organization, tactics, the problem of freedom and order within the movement and between it and the normative society. There seems to be a growing consensus that nonviolence requires certain minimally favourable conditions. Scott, for example, sees a need for a strong impartial international power capable of augmenting the nonviolent movements for justice within or between armed states which have shown how onerous and implacable they can be. To say this is to recognize that nonviolence does not work miracles by itself. Martin Luther King does not hesitate to call upon govermental authorities to use force to restore order when nonviolent Negroes are mobbed by violent whites. This is a tacit admission of the limits of human endurance in the given situation; it is not possible to ask men to suffer perpetually or to seek victory only through sainthood.

But we would concede too much if we said only that nonviolence is coming down to earth and adjusting to irrefragable human nature, for we do not yet know too much about human nature. I do not mean the perennial moral debate about its intrinsic goodness, sinfulness, transiency or evil, but rather its inner complexities. This is what distinguishes the two cadres mentioned earlier—the one predicated on a rigid moralism, the other on a risky process of interaction. We need to know far more than we do at present about the workings of human relationships. Why did the police captain respond as he did? How much of the dynamic was in his specific personality and character structure? How far can Gandhi's classic concept of a "soul force" generated from within explain this episode? Must we try to adapt the "soul force" concept to the situation, or does this case perhaps call for an alternative hypothesis? In science there are, for example, molecular and wave theories of light. Each is useful; neither pretends to be a final, exclusive statement of absolute truth.

It is hard to say whether Floyd Dell or Gandhi or others of the earlier period would recognize or welcome the present phase of thinking and experimentation as compatible with their legacy, for in many ways the terms in which they understood the meaning of science were different from those that apply today. The beginning of wisdom, said Socrates, is the confession of our present ignorance. If a single sentence could sum up the great legacy of Gandhi and his colleagues, I think it would be this: they led us out of the darkness of conventional wisdom and showed us the falsity of the generally accepted belief in the supremacy of violence. Dazzled by the brilliance of this great deed, we were tempted to see it as magical—as children are prone to do. Now we see where we are, at the foot of the path of enlightenment, scarcely knowing how far it may lead us, but aware that we have a long way to go.

SECTION TWO

SATYAGRAHA VERSUS DURAGRAHA: THE LIMITS OF SYMBOLIC VIOLENCE

Joan V. Bondurant

Every leader who seeks to win a battle without violence and who presumes to precipitate a war against conventional attitudes and arrangements—however prejudiced they may be—would do well to probe the subtleties which distinguish satyagraha from other forms of action without overt violence. There are essential elements in Gandhian satyagraha which do not readily meet the eye. The readiness with which Gandhi's name is invoked and the self-satisfaction with which leaders of movements throughout the world make reference to Gandhian methods are not always backed by an understanding of either the subtleties or the basic principles of satyagraha. It is important to pose a question and to state a challenge to those who believe that they know how a Gandhian movement is to be conducted. For nonviolence alone is weak, non-cooperation in itself could lead to defeat, and civil disobedience without creative action may end in alienation. How, then, does satyagraha differ from other approaches? This question can be explored by contrasting satyagraha with concepts of passive resistance defined by the Indian word, duragraha.

Duragraha means prejudgement. Perhaps better than any other single word, it connotes the attributes of passive resistance.

Duragraha may be said to be stubborn resistance in a cause, or wilfulness. The distinctions between duragraha and satyagraha as these words are used to designate concepts of direct social action are to be found in each of the major facets of such action.[1] Let us examine (1) the character of the objective for which the action is undertaken, (2) the process through which the objective is expected to be secured, and (3) the styles which characterize the respective approaches. Satyagraha and duragraha are compared below in each of these three aspects by considering their relative treatment of first, pressure and persuasion, and second, guilt and responsibility. Finally, we shall have a look at the meaning and limitations of symbolic violence.

I. PRESSURE AND PERSUASION

If non-cooperation, civil disobedience, fasting, and nonviolent strike represent only partial—but never essential—expressions of satyagraha in action, this is because the Gandhian method goes well beyond the more simple and direct use of pressure. The objective of satyagraha is the constructive transforming of relationships in a manner which not only effects a change of policy but also assures the restructuring of the situation which led to conflict. This calls for a modification of attitudes and requires fulfilment of the significant needs of all parties originally in conflict. The fulfilling of needs is both an objective and a means for effecting fundamental change.

The immediate cause for action, both of a satyagrahic and duragrahic nature, is an allegedly unjust policy. The search for a solution to the conflict which results, once the policy and its proponents are opposed, is understood by the duragrahi in terms of applying pressure with skill and in sufficient strength to force the opponent to stand down. In satyagraha the search itself partakes of the objective, for it affords the stimulation and provides the satisfactions which attend all creative efforts. The dynamics of satyagraha are end-creating. The objective is, conceptually, only a starting point. The end cannot be predicted, and must necessarily be left open. As we shall see below, the process, as it relates ends to means, is complex.

In contrast, duragraha approaches the conflict with a set of prejudgements. The opponent is, *ipso facto*, wrong. The objective is to overcome the opponent and to destroy his position. The task the duragrahi sets himself is to demonstrate the fallacious or immoral character of the position held by the opponent, and to substitute for it a preconceived correct and morally right position. A duragraha campaign has the often satisfying advantage of being direct and simple. The objective is given, and the end conclusive.

The uses of pressure are valued by both satyagrahi and duragrahi. Pressure, as the action of a force against some opposing force, has a place in both approaches. But in satyagraha this mechanical meaning of the term describes only the initial action in a complex system of dynamics. The satyagrahi develops an interacting force (with the opponent) which produces new movement and which may change the direction or even the content of the force. The opponent is engaged in a manner which will result in the transformation of relationships into a form or pattern which could not have been predicted with any precision. The subtleties of response from the opponent are channelled back into the satyagrahi's movement and these responding pressures are given the maximum opportunity to influence subsequent procedures, and even the content of the satyagrahi's claims and objectives. This process has been described elsewhere as the Gandhian dialectic.[2]

Pressure is understood in duragraha in the sense of steady pushing or thrusting to effect weight or burden, and usually it results in distress. Pressure in the mechanical sense is not developed further into a process reflecting influences from the opposition or, to be more exact, duragraha does not develop such a process through design. The strike is typical of this straightforward application of pressure. The strike is commonly used to effect economic pressure, and is intended to hurt business, or to strain relationships so that normal functions are brought to a halt, or at least inhibited. Normal functioning cannot be resumed until policy changes are instituted.

In the field of labour relations, sophisticated forms of collective bargaining represent an advanced technique of negotiation and compromise. Relationships do indeed change, but these changes are in degree, and only to the extent that degree can become so great as to represent kind do they reflect fundamental transformation. The process of strike, or passive resistance, or duragraha in its most common forms, amounts to the intensification of pressure or the shifting of points of attack until a settlement is reached through capitulation or through compromise. The objective does not partake of a search, nor does it require an explicit intent to discover solutions which will satisfy the opponent. Duragraha seeks concessions; satyagraha sets out to develop alternatives which will satisfy antagonists on all sides.

Creativity is essential in satyagraha—not only in devising techniques adapted to given instances of conflict, but also as an inherent part of the philosophy which underlies satyagraha. Satyagraha may be likened to the thought process objectified. One can draw upon Dewey's analysis of purposive action to suggest the process in operation. Satyagraha on the field of action is reminiscent of the process of inquiry and solution of problems as described by Samuel Beer: "An enquiring mind comes to a problem with certain purposes, but in its contact with fact those purposes are modified and enriched. New traits in a situation may be perceived and that perception will modify the purposes which were brought to the situation. Thus creative solutions arise. In the continuum of inquiry, the inquirer's perspective is continually developed. The purposes and interests which he brings to inquiry guide him in his contacts with the facts. But what he learns about the facts in turn guides the development of his interests and purposes. If he is to learn, he must start from what he already knows. In that sense his approach to the facts is limited and biased and he is 'blind' to many aspects of the facts. But we must not forget that he can learn and that in the course of learning his initial purposes may be greatly enlarged and deepened."[3]

Over against the harassment and distress commonly effected in duragraha is set the fundamentally supportive nature of satyagraha. As the satyagrahi moves to bring about change in the situation through persuading his opponent to modify or alter the position under attack, he seeks to strengthen interpersonal relationships and intrapersonal satisfactions through acts of support and, where appropriate, through service to the opponent. This approach goes well beyond the nebulous and often platitudinous insistence that all men are brothers and that love for the opponent dominates the feeling and dictates the action. It is based upon a psychologically sound understanding about suffering and the capacity of man to change.

The discovery that fundamental change is accompanied by suffering can be understood through a bit of self-introspection. The more rigid and fixed the attitude, or the more habitual the behaviour, the more painful the process of change. Persisting, obstinate attitudes are not without their cause. They perform a function which has its origin in personal history and they are part of an intrapersonal economy, any disruption of which will be experienced as distress and even as a major personal threat. It follows from these elementary psychological facts that change can best be effected in the context of reassurance and through efforts to delimit the area of attack. It may, indeed, be impossible to bring about a change in attitudes and to achieve the transformation of relationships without extensive reassurance and support. Otherwise the conflict becomes exacerbated, the opposition hardened, and the prospects of a life-and-death struggle enhanced.

When the dispute is over a simple policy change which does not challenge long-standing custom or in which the emotional investment is low, then duragraha may well succeed. The undermining of the opponent may result in sufficient distress to bring about compromise and concession within tolerable limits of change. But when fundamental attitudes and long-established beliefs are challenged, the required change may be impossible to tolerate without considerable supportive effort. When change of such fundamental nature is involved, the harassment of a strike, demonstration, or other form of duragrahic attack will not achieve the response or perhaps will achieve it only through overwhelming the opponent and destroying the possibility of a sound, transformed relationship.

Some form of destruction is involved in all change. In satyagraha the more serious the expected change (and, therefore, the more radical the destruction of established patterns), the more essential it is to undertake counter and parallel constructive efforts of a high order.

The creative process of satyagraha is applied in a supportive style towards a restructured end. This integrative mode of approach does not depend upon ideal views of mankind, but, rather, it is based upon the knowledge of the psychological needs common to every man.

II. GUILT AND RESPONSIBILITY

Wherever nonviolent movements are undertaken in the interest of asserting or establishing human or civil or "inherent" rights, the atmosphere is ripe for the emergence of an attitude which threatens constructive solutions. Self-righteousness is an extension into the realm of personal ascription of the sounder quality of moral indignation. Self-righteousness attaches to the actions of some through a failure to examine personal motives or to appreciate its affect in the objective circumstance. But to others, self-righteousness follows upon an explicit use of the alleged, or assumed, guilt of others. For there are those who set out to disclose the guilt of others, and to use this disclosure as a technique in prosecuting their "nonviolent" attacks. The purpose of this emphasis upon guilt and the manner in which guilt disclosure is intended to function is not always clear. It may be dictated by a consideration indirectly related to the given conflict, as for example, a commitment to an ideological position not germane to the conflict at hand. Among such commitments, perhaps the best known is the doctrine of class warfare.

The author has on occasion heard participants in phases of the American civil rights movement instructed to disrupt business in retail shops for the purpose not only of putting pressure upon shop-owners to integrate their work force, but also of harassing customers so that they will recognize their own guilt. The argument is that the ordinary American housewife goes about her business in the markets with a false sense of innocence. She must be brought to understand that she, too, is guilty of discrimination. It may be that the unconcerned third party is in this way forced to recognize a fault and, in recognizing guilt, he (or she) will join or at least tacitly support the demonstrators. Such an expectation is, on its face, somewhat unrealistic, but however the expectation is to be assessed, the procedure reveals a point of critical significance. When a group is enjoined to disclose guilt on the part of others, while at the same time they set about demonstrating their own guiltlessness, the mechanism suggests psychological projection, the true meaning of which is an unconscious sense of guilt in the demonstrators themselves. It may be guilt of prejudice against the middleclass of which the American housewife is such an eminent representative. Or it may reflect unconscious guilt on the part of the demonstrator against the very persons upon whose behalf he is demonstrating. The symbolic meaning of such action is noted below (section III) in the discussion of symbolic violence. Whatever the objective, the interest in producing a sense of guilt through discomfitting others is destined to exacerbate the conflict. This may indeed be its intent, and certainly it might succeed, in uncomplicated situations where simple duragraha has some chance of success. But where extensive and fundamental change is desired, reliance upon this procedure will fail of any clear and constructive purpose. For guilt is a destructive force and is closely related to fear and hatred.

The central point of criticism of the active use of guilt is not that the self-righteous demonstrator may himself harbour guilt, but, rather, that he is evidently unaware of his own guilt. The freely informed and acutely aware individual does not point the finger of shame at others. He sets about his task in quite different ways. And in recognizing his own prejudices—wherever they may lie—he engages with his opponents, as well as with his companions, in the struggle in order to search for constructive solutions and to transform relationships. Gandhi repeatedly warned of the dangers involved in focussing upon the misdeeds of the opponent. "After all", he observed, "no one is wicked by nature . . . and if others are wicked, are we the less so? That attitude is inherent in satyagraha."[4] Earlier, Gandhi had written, "Whenever I see an erring man, I say to myself, I have also erred",[5] and again, in opposing the use of sitting dharna, he explained: "We must refrain from crying 'shame, shame' to anybody, we must not use any coercion to persuade other people to adopt our way. We must guarantee to them the same freedom we claim for ourselves."[6]

Among the most constant and abiding efforts of the satyagrahi is the extension of areas of rationality. He recognizes the significance of the irrational, but, in contrast to the duragrahi, the satyagrahi seeks to minimize and not to use the irrational.

The relationship to those one seeks to change calls for a high level of responsibility. It is incumbent upon the satyagrahi actively to concern himself with the problems he is presenting to his opponent. His recognition of the burden his demands place upon his opponent is prerequisite to action. He is expecting his opponent to renounce or reject patterns of behaviour to which he has long been accustomed—and oftentimes behaviour which appears not only justified to the opponent, but which may also seem to him to accord with high moral standards. If conventional social forms are involved which carry sanctions for failure to comply (as in the law or established custom), the demonstrator, by his act of contravention, is presenting to the opponent and to third parties formally not involved in the conflict, the necessity to make a choice. This choice may well require an act of faith on the part of the opponent. For the demonstrator is stating a position contrary to hitherto accepted form and usage. He is saying, in effect, "The established conventions and authorities are wrong; what I am doing is right; accept my way". In acting upon this assertion, the demonstrator is calling for the opponent to have faith in the demonstrator's judgement. A well-launched demonstration is calculated to confront the opponent in such a manner that he is forced to make a choice. Opponents and otherwise uninvolved onlookers are faced with the need to examine their own behaviour. Conduct which was formerly taken for granted is in this way questioned. If the opponent and the onlooker persist in the old way, the behaviour which was formerly habitual and automatic now is consciously taken, and for that very reason it is likely to gain the strength of conviction.

The responsibility for forcing a choice requires to be seriously weighed. Questions should be raised about one's justification in asking the opponent to trust this judgement which is alien and unwelcome. When responsibility of this order is carefully studied, the need for supportive activity to the opponent can be more clearly understood. The details of support and the manner in which it may be undertaken can best emerge in the course of examining the extent of this responsibility within the context of a given conflict situation. When conscious decision is forced upon others, it becomes all the more important that guilt be dispelled, fear abated, and passions controlled. The forcing of new choices is a tactic for effecting change in a static situation. At the critical juncture when choice is forced, the satyagrahi must shoulder his greatest burdens. He will be confronted by persons seized with doubts and uncertainties and it is his obligation to tolerate their abuse, should it be offered, and to find ways in which to strengthen and reassure his opponents. His own strength at such junctures is put to the greatest test, and his own capacity for creative thought and imaginative act is taxed to the fullest.

As the satyagrahi engages his opponent in constructive conflict, his responsibility is to be understood also in terms of responsiveness. The open-ended nature of his objectives and the transforming function of the process require that he extend to his opponent not only the respect implied by humanistic values, but also a measure of trust which goes well beyond that tolerated by proponents of duragraha. It is of the essence of satyagraha that every response from the opponent be accepted as genuine and that all undertakings of the opponent be considered to have been given in good faith. In satyagraha this is not only a matter of strategy, based upon an active search for truth, but it is also an effective tactic. If the opponent gives any indication of changing his position and altering his behaviour—in either direction—this indication must be given full recognition. It is essential to accept as genuine threats of violence or acts of hostility as well as any expression of intent on the part of the opponent to move towards a resolution of the conflict. To demonstrate acceptance and belief in the opponent's good faith will serve to hold the opponent to his word, to diminish his hesitation, and to encourage the realization of his perhaps shaky intent. It is a basic principle of satyagraha to consider as genuine all counter-suggestions.

The proponent of duragraha is characteristically conditioned to doubt every move made by his opponent, and to suppose that his opponent is acting in bad faith. The opponent must be actively opposed, his every act suspected. This readiness to doubt the good faith of an opponent may be put forward as a piece of sophistication, based upon experience or knowledge of human nature. In operation such an approach is poor strategy and worse tactics. The satyagrahi's move to credit the opponent with genuine intent requires the capacity to tolerate abuse (as in instances where the opponent has, in fact, acted in bad faith) and to exercise forbearance. Gandhi once said that "impatience is a phase of violence".[7] In duragraha, efforts on the part of the opponent are oftentimes flaunted because they may upset the timetable of planned demonstration and result in inconvenience to the demonstrators. At such times the opponent is especially likely to be suspect. The manner in which the duragrahi readily places demonstration at the top of his priorities, even at the cost of resolving the immediate conflict, is illustrated by many of the student demonstrations organized in support of the civil rights movement in the United States. The author witnessed one such demonstration in a university city. A civil rights group, largely made up of students, challenged merchants to include non-white employees in proportion to the city's non-white population. After serious consideration the merchants did, in fact, take steps towards the integration of their employees and moved through the city's welfare commission to set up a training program for potential employees from the minority group. Nevertheless, demonstrations and picketing were launched. When asked why they persisted in demonstrating even though the merchants had taken steps toward the desired objective, the leader of the demonstrators replied that the merchants had not acted in good faith, that their proposals were empty promises, and their hiring of a few Negroes amounted only to "tokenism". In this instance there was considerable evidence that the merchants had, indeed, acted in good faith. To announce that the opponent was not acting in good faith could result only in bitterness and further conflict. One of the results in this case was the alienation of many townspeople who had initially supported the movement and who were potential supporters of all civil rights efforts.

The demonstration in question illustrates these two characteristics of duragraha—failure to accept the opponent's moves as being taken in good faith, and taking action according to the convenience of the demonstrators. The timing of this demonstration had been scheduled for Christmas week. Students had a holiday during these days and were free to demonstrate and picket. An even more important consideration was the business loss merchants would incur through interference with Christmas shopping. Paralleling these considerations was the suspicion that the merchants would do anything to prevent disruption of business during this most profitable season. The allegation that the merchants were acting in bad faith was conditioned by and to some extent arose out of this suspicion.

In the incident cited above, the demonstrators were of the opinion that they were using Gandhian tactics. Any familiarity with Gandhian satyagraha would have precluded this misjudgement. Indians will remember well the occasions upon which Gandhi refrained from taking action against opponents when inconvenience *to the opponent* was evident. He would not allow a movement aimed directly at Englishmen to continue during Easter Sunday and, out of respect for his opponent's susceptibility to tropical heat, he would call off action during the hottest hours of the day. It would have been in the Gandhian spirit had these student demonstrators (1) taken the merchants' proposals as a genuine indication of their intention, (2) explained to the merchants that, even though their demands had not been met in full, they would withdraw their pickets during the important Christmas week so that business would not be unduly hurt, and (3) turned their efforts into solving the problems of organizing a training program to provide skilled workers from the non-white community.

III. THE LIMITS OF SYMBOLIC VIOLENCE

Those who lead movements aimed at effecting change have a choice of means, and in the storehouse of strategies symbolic violence ranks high in popularity. There is no denying that all forms of violence have some chance of success in securing immediate, well-defined objectives. Symbolic violence, as a form of violence, and duragraha as a form of symbolic violence share this potential for success. We have seen above how satyagraha, as contrasted to duragraha, has superior potential in situations of conflict in which fundamental changes of attitude and behaviour constitute the objective. A concluding word may be said about the nature of duragraha as symbolic violence and the limitations inherent in its use.

"Symbolic" pertains to something that denotes or stands for something else. The distinction should be made between, on the one hand, that which stands for something else because it has been given consciously a conventional or contrived significance and, on the other hand, that which represents an unconscious wish (in this case, to be violent), a counter-desire (in this case, to be nonviolent), or both at once. Those who consciously set out with violent intent and destructive objective to prosecute their action through means which are not physically violent may be said to engage in symbolic violence in the first sense—their nonviolent acts have the contrived significance of violence once-removed. Those who, on the other hand, are attached to the ideals of nonviolence while at the same time they unwittingly engage in destructive acts, may be involved in symbolic violence described in the second (psychoanalytic) meaning of "symbolic".

The individual who uses symbolic violence but who believes that he is using no violence may be unaware of the substitute nature of his behaviour which, in its unconscious meaning, is violent and destructive. The behaviour of those who consciously contrive to use symbolic violence, as well as those who believe their actions to be free from violence, may both be substitutive in nature. The manner in which the guilt of others is used to promote a "nonviolent" movement, as illustrated above (in section II), can be better understood by applying this second meaning of "symbolic".

The destructive effects of violence are widely recognized, and it is readily conceded that these effects extend beyond the physical. Violence once-removed, through unconscious symbolization, and acted upon in ways which exclude the cruder physical forms of destruction may indeed be more treacherous than frank and open violence.

The use of a symbol, if the results are to be understood (to say nothing of controlled), requires a high degree of awareness. Those who consciously set out to apply symbolic violence have a better chance of control and effectiveness than those who proceed with forms of duragraha without the recognition that they are involved in violence-once-removed. It is for this reason that the leader who would organize a movement without violence should be pressed to understand his techniques and to explore his strategies.

Wherever men meet to consider how they shall struggle against great odds for freedoms or for cherished rights, the name of Gandhi readily comes to their lips, and his image of greatness and success strengthens their will. Let them know the distinctions between Gandhian satyagraha and forms of struggle which are here described as duragraha. For without this understanding, the seminal contribution of Gandhi could be lost.

For those who do understand the many ways in which satyagraha is distinguished, a challenge is posed: the methods must be refined and techniques developed for this age of advanced technology. The Gandhian philosophy of conflict is sound. Who is to press forward the experiments in technique? The first step is to reject the falsity and failure which inhere in duragraha. New strategies for the constructive conduct of conflict, building upon and advancing beyond satyagraha, can be designed, and techniques to implement them await invention. In the face of unparalleled risk, there are few challenges which present such scope for creativity, and perhaps none holds out so much promise.

---

1. Satyagraha, as a word coined to describe the technique Gandhi first used in South Africa and continued to develop in India, is readily understood to mean the Gandhian method of conducting conflict without violence. The word satyagraha is a compound of two Sanskrit nouns: satya, "truth" (from sat, "being", with a suffix-*ya*) and agraha, "firm grasping" (a noun

made from the verb agrah, which is the root grah, "seize, grasp", with the verbal prefix *a*, "to, towards").

Duragraha is infrequently used in the sense of social action. The prefix *dur* (used in compound for *dus*) denotes "difficult". One meaning of duragraha is "bias". I am introducing the word here not only to enable the discussion at hand, but also to promote the refinement of language in describing techniques of social action. Many so-called satyagraha campaigns could more accurately be described as duragraha. The usefulness of the word in this context will become clear as the text progresses.

2. Joan V. Bondurant, *Conquest of Violence: The Gandhian Philosophy of Conflict* (Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1958), Chapter VI.
3. Quoted from Samuel Beer, *The City of Reason* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1949), p. 42. Professor Beer develops "the philosophical ideas which support the theory of a free society", and a political theory derived from Whitehead's metaphysic "based on reason and directed toward liberty". The philosophy on which his form of ethics is based "emphasizes the relativity of all institutions . . . the gulf between the ideal and the actual is never bridged, although the duty of man is continually to try to bridge it".
4. D.G. Tendulkar, *Mahatma: Life of Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi*, Vol. V, 1938-1940 (8 vols. Bombay: Jhaveri and Tendulkar, 1952), p. 328.
5. *Young India*, 7 June 1920.
6. *Ibid.*, 9 February 1921.
7. *Ibid.*, 18 October 1927.

THE BEST SOLVER OF CONFLICTS

Richard B. Gregg

Believers in nonviolence find limitless opportunities for discussion and argument about it. This article is intended as a possible help in those discussions.

Let us first review a few aspects of the mess the world is in at present, then consider what must be the characteristics or features of a successful way out and finally the reasons why nonviolent resistance meets those needs.

It is a commonplace that the world has grown much smaller in space and time and has become physically more closely integrated, much faster, than the moral development of mankind. Some people say that man is no better morally than he was ten thousand years ago, and that modern primitives are in many ways more decent in their human relationships than so-called "civilized" man. Certainly, what moral development there has been has been very spotty, uneven and self-inconsistent. We have had the horrors and brutalities of the two world shooting wars and their consequences, and yet during the same period wonderful programs of aid to other countries, programs quite new in the history of the world. Some say the motives for such aid have been far-seeing selfishness, but even if that were partly true, nevertheless there has been much sincere, unselfish kindness. In some ways men have become more callous, in other ways more sensitive. But the main point is that man's moral development has not kept pace with his technological development, and the result is more and intenser conflicts than ever before.

The enormity of violence and cruelty during the last fifty years has bewildered and stultified mankind. The vast scale and complexity of modern social, economic and political forces makes us feel frustrated and helpless.

Out of the continuing bewilderment and frustration has come a large degree of inertia and social irresponsibility, and among some of the younger people violence, despair, rebellion and contempt of older generations. Many people seek escape and compensation in cinemas, gambling, alcohol and drugs.

The world has been deluged too long by fear, hate and suspicion. The Buddha said that anger is like spitting against the wind; it always comes back on you. America's hatred of Communism blew back on Americans in the forms of McCarthyism and the Un-American Activities Committee and many other forms of suspicion, fear and divisiveness. In the long run such divisiveness, widespread, leads to violence, insanity and death.

Joan Bondurant, in her *Conquest of Violence,* cogently pointed out that in the last resort most conservatives, liberals, socialists, communists and some anarchists all rely on violence as the ultimate creator and maintainer of order and stability. Look at how most of them joined in on the war effort of World War II. The university educated are stronger for State violence than are the illiterate.

Politicians and military men seem to think that man's fears, greed, pride, lethargy and weaknesses are the main basis for policy at home and abroad, and so advocate chiefly preparations for more violence. They call that being practical.

You might be so naive as to think that the theologians, the men who study spiritual and religious ultimates, would object to all this strenuously and unanimously. But no, the majority of America's leading theologians have for many years been saying, explicitly or implicitly, that man is inherently sinful and cannot climb out of his fallen condition; that the evil habits of history are stronger than anything else in the world; that governments (i.e. the organs of immoral society) must be upheld; that war is the lesser of two evils; that the Sermon on the Mount is an impossible ideal. Impliedly they make no allowance for the possibility of any new, strong, human force in history, even though they are faced by such new things as airplanes, antibiotics, radio and atom bombs. Recently, faced with really imminent destruction of themselves, they have begun to hedge and admit that some degrees of violence are not advisable. "Where there is no vision, the people perish." "Practical" people say that it is silly and impossible to expect governments and other large organizations to obey moral laws.

Over all hang the H bombs, ICB missiles and annihilation of all mankind.

A magnificent mess, is it not?

Well, if there is a way out, what features or characteristics must it have in order to deal effectively with the above-described mess?

(a) It must be nonviolent and persuasive.

(b) It must involve simple action more than talk. We cannot all be orators.

(c) Since we are all endangered, the action must be such that everyone can take part in it. That means, of course, that women as well as men can take active part in it. It is better if children also can participate.

(d) It must be capable, by its very nature and processes, of inspiring interest, trust, and hope among the participants, the indifferent, the curious, the lazy and other onlookers, and even the opponents.

(e) It must compel deeper thinking and feeling and be morally educative to everyone.

(f) It must be capable, by its very processes, of stimulating moral and spiritual growth in the participants and all beholders, faster and more effectively and thoroughly than exhortations or present institutions.

(g) It must be realistic, taking account of the inevitability of conflicts and of the presence of and possibilities for both evil and good in every person, including participants and opponents as well as others.

(h) It must be based on an unshakable belief in the unity of mankind, and that this unity is deeper, stronger, more enduring and more important than the differences, whether the differences be of race, culture, nationality, economics, politics, assumptions, or any kind of ideology.

(i) It must be a search for deeper and greater truth, both individual and social.

Why would these conditions be met and an effective way out of the worst of our troubles be produced by nonviolent resistance to injustice and wrong?

(1) Nonviolent resistance is a form of vigorous action, without violence and with a disposition indicated by that abused word, love. In this context that disposition may be described in the words of one author as "an interest in people so deep and determined and lasting as to be creative; a profound knowledge of or faith in the ultimate possibilities of human nature; a courage based on a conscious or subconscious realization of the underlying unity of all life and eternal values or eternal life of the human spirit; and strong and deep desire for and love of truth; and a humility that is not cringing or self-deprecating or timid but rather a true sense of proportion in regard to people, things, qualities and ultimate values. It is a sort of intelligence or knowledge. It is not mawkish or sentimental. It calls for patience, understanding and imagination. It is not superhuman or exceedingly rare. These traits of love, faith, courage, honesty and humility exist in potentiality or actuality in every person. We have all seen such love in mothers and in some teachers.

(2) Women can not only take active part in movements of nonviolent resistance; they are better at it than men. Children can also participate, as messengers, for instance. Children took part in Gandhi's early struggle at Bardoli, India.

(3) Nonviolent resistance is honest and realistic. It recognizes that in every person and every institution there is the presence and possibility of both good and evil.

(4) It recognizes and uses the fact that these forces for good and evil are living forces, that therefore they obey the law of growth (namely that living forces and organisms respond to stimuli, and that the kind of response called growth takes place after many, many repetitions of slight stimuli, what in the moral

realm we would call gentle stimuli). In nonviolent resistance these gentle stimuli are nonviolence (indicating responsibility and respect for the personality of the opponent) and love. These stimuli are an inherent and necessary part of this method of handling conflict.

(5) Nonviolent resistance trusts the potential decency in the opponent. Henry L. Stimson, who served the U.S. Government under both F.D. Roosevelt and Harry Truman, at one time as Secretary of War and at another as Secretary of State, in a memorandum to President Roosevelt in September 1945 wrote, "The chief lesson I have learned in a long life is that the only way you can make a man trustworthy is to trust him, and the surest way to make him untrustworthy is to distrust him and show your distrust". That is to say, trust is creative.

(6) Another way to say it is that nonviolence, like the military philosophy, recognizes that almost everyone at times is lazy, selfish, greedy, unthinking, irresponsible and afraid of something. But unlike the military, it does not play on or rely on those weaknesses. It is more realistic because it realizes that man is also just as capable of being energetic, unselfish, generous, thoughtful, responsible and brave. It appeals strongly and constantly to that better side of man's nature, and takes pains to stimulate and cultivate those better traits in everyone—participants, opponents and spectators.

(7) Because of a strong and deep realization of human unity and its superior importance, nonviolent resisters are able to forgive opponents for the harm they may have done. This unity is more important and enduring than any injuries committed. It has lasted through all the evils recorded in history.

(8) Nonviolent resistance is persuasive by virtue of its elements of adherence to truth, respect for the personality of the opponent, humility, responsibility, love and moral beauty. It is a dramatic appeal to the best in everyone. The price of the struggle is assumed and paid by the nonviolent resisters, by their voluntary suffering.

(9) Some may say that the two world wars and the cold war and all the cruelties of the last fifty years prove that man's moral nature is so nearly extinct that it is childish to appeal to

it. But the propaganda and censorships and evasions of all governments also prove that the governments have to make their claims appear moral in order to win support from the people. So morality is not dead. The people of all the world hunger for it with a deep hunger.

(10) Nonviolent resistance avoids the dangers and evils of violence and all the moral aftermath of violence, resentment, hatred, desire for revenge, small or large.

(11) It offers a way out of our present frustrations and sense of impotence about public problems. Its very simplicity is a great relief.

(12) It is linked with our ideas of democracy and liberty and government by the consent of the governed. It is a way of voting, more effective in many situations in our large-scale governments than the traditional ballot.

(13) Nonviolent resistance has and steadily uses in all its action the idealism, humanity and compassion which Communism claims but in action denies by its lust for power, its tyranny and cruelties.

(14) Nonviolent resistance constantly uses means consistent with the ends it seeks, and therefore has far greater chances of success and smaller chances of compromise with evil.

(15) It does not leave social change to governments which are so often unresponsive and reluctant to alter old and obsolete methods of making or directing social change.

(16) Because it relies on nonviolent persuasion—and true persuasion is rarely a rapid progress—the advances which it secures come slowly enough so that conservative forces are able to adapt themselves without destroying social continuity. Yet the speed of desirable change achieved by nonviolent resistance is much greater than that of existing institutions, for the chief aim of institutions is to maintain the *status quo.*

(17) Nonviolent resistance is as interested in order as any conservative, but its order is a finer order, nearer to moral truth and social and economic justice. The conservative person is inclined to believe that only what he prefers and is used to constitute order. But there are many kinds of order. As long as there is life or existence of any kind there must be change, and

the pace of change varies from time to time.

(18) Nonviolent resistance, by reason of its moral nature, dramatic quality and persuasiveness, is infectious and gathers adherents.

(19) It is experimenting at the growing edge of a new and finer intergroup morality. It therefore offers adventure. Gandhi entitled his autobiography "My Experiments with Truth". Mistakes may be made in these experiments but that is common to all human movements and institutions, and therefore need not trouble us unduly.

(20) When seemingly insoluble problems arise, the atmosphere and use of nonviolence hold society together while the problems are being lived down, old dogmas and old fighters die off and new generations take over.

(21) Nonviolent resistance communicates both verbalized meanings and meanings that cannot be put into words—these latter meanings being the deeper and subtler ones that go into man's group and subconscious life, into his spirit and assumptions.

(22) It rests on a firm belief in the unity of all mankind; also on the belief that all people can learn from experience.

(23) It is in accord with the insights and traditions of the greatest moral and spiritual leaders of mankind—Socrates, Jesus, Buddha, Lao-Tsu and Gandhi.

THE SPIRITUAL BASIS OF SATYAGRAHA

K.M. Munshi

Gandhi is too near us in time to enable us to judge him from the perspective of history and human thought. Patriots may call him "Father of the Nation"; historians may call him the "Liberator of India". However, it must not be forgotten that he was a Mahatma in the line of the great men who have stood, fought and suffered for vindicating the moral and spiritual values against the forces of barbarism.

The shifting code of behaviour accepted by one age or one civilization had little appeal for him. He stood for the supremacy of the eternal Moral Order, of which the prophets had spoken and the poets had sung. His achievements were all the more notable because he lived and worked in an age which, by and large, ignores God and scoffs at morals in the matter of social and political activities. He did not only stand for the Moral Order; he tried to translate it into his individual life. He came to pledge himself progressively not only to nonviolence and truth but also non-stealing, non-waste and non-possession—ahimsa, satya, asteya, brahmacharya and aparigraha—described by Patanjali in the *Yoga Sutra* as the mahavratas (the great vows), which a yogi has to observe regardless of time and place.

Truth was God to Gandhi. "Once I believed that God is Truth", he wrote once. "I now believe that Truth is God".

"God as Truth", he wrote, "has been for me a treasure beyond price. May He be so to every one of us." His whole life was an experiment in living for truth, a mighty effort to weld thought, word and deed into a unit. His achievements, great though they were, were only a partial expression of this effort.

Living by Truth in this sense led him to two far-reaching conclusions: first, pursuit of Truth in the individual life can only be the keystone of enduring creative activity; secondly, whosoever seeks to realise Truth must be ready to back it up with his life. To use the beautiful words of Romain Rolland: "A man's first duty is to be himself, to remain himself even at the cost of life."

Truth, thus viewed, is the only spiritual charter for free souls. It is the assertion of the dignity of man. It is a revolt against regimentation of life; against passive subordination to dogmas, social, political or religious; against the despotic unity which is being imposed by the political and social theories of modern Europe which deify the state. At the same time, Gandhi felt that living for one's truth may become unethical unless it is harnessed to nonviolence. It was this alchemy of welding truth with nonviolence which led him to forge the weapon of satyagraha (literally "insistence on truth").

If one decides to stand up for the truth as one sees it and backs it up with one's life, one must also accept the limitations of nonviolence and abjure the use of brute force. If this is done, the technique acquires a new edge and a fresh meaning. The use of satyagraha carries with it many and varied implications. The man who adopts the weapon has to direct it against the evil, not the evil-doer, a very difficult thing to do without a continuous process of self-purification. At the same time, he has to see that it does not inflict violence on the other side, but is content to invite suffering on himself. Suffering, deliberately invited, in support of a cause which one considers righteous, naturally purges the mind of the satyagrahi of ill-will and removes the element of bitterness from the antagonist.

The efficacy of satyagraha depends upon the tenacity to resist evil which, while it abjures force, develops in the satyagrahi the faculty to face all risks cheerfully. Thus, the emphasis is transferred from aggression by force to resistance by tenacity.

It is only when these requirements are met that nonviolent satyagraha becomes a mighty weapon of resistance both in the struggle for freedom as well as in self-realisation. The results are reached by slow degrees, it is true, but the resultant bitterness is short-lived.

Satyagraha in some form or the other was adopted by various sets of people at different times in history. But it was left to Gandhi to perfect the technique by which mass resistance could succeed in achieving enduring results without resorting to force and without leaving a legacy of bitterness behind. The technique acquires great importance in the modern world when instruments of coercion and destruction are concentrated in the hands of a few rulers in every country. Those who serve the cause of freedom or collective welfare have no other efficacious weapon left, except satyagraha. We see this illustrated in the satyagraha offered by the Negroes in U.S.A.

Satyagraha as a social force is not a negative creed of the pacifists, a pious wish, a faith devoid of passion. It is an activity resulting from an effective will to vindicate the supremacy of the Moral Order. In the hour of danger, it demands the highest form of heroism as well as self-control.

Satyagraha, as Gandhi often said, is a weapon of the strong, not a cover for the cowardice of the weak. As he himself recognised, in the practical affairs of men there may be occasions when nonviolence may have to be tempered with the defensive use of violence.

Nonviolence is absolute in principle; but on occasions, as the one which presented itself to Arjuna in the *Bhagavad-Gita*, it has to be a mental attitude, not an absolute refusal to resist violence by violent methods.

The power of satyagraha lies in the satyagrahi's firm determination to uphold his truth at the cost of his life in a spirit of humility. This power only comes to a satyagrahi when he acquires the faith that the cause he fights for is God-given. This aspect of satyagraha was thus expressed by Gandhi: "But who am I? I have no strength save what God gives me. I have no authority over my countrymen save the purely moral. If he holds me to be a sure instrument for the spread of nonviolence in place of the awful violence now ruling the earth, He will give me the strength and show me the way. My greatest weapon is mute prayer. The cause of peace is, therefore, in God's good hands. Nothing can happen but His will expressed in His eternal, changeless Law which is He." "God is a living presence to me. I am surer of His existence than of the fact that you and I are sitting in this room. I may live without air and water but not without Him." "You may pluck out my eyes, but that cannot kill me. But blast my belief in God and I am dead." "Whatever striking things I have done in life, I have not done prompted by reason but by instinct, I would say God."

Gandhi had none of the sanctions which position, power and wealth give; the only sanction he possessed proceeded from his nearness to God. It is this which gave him an authority over the hearts of men, an authority which was spiritual and moral. To a world dominated by what Aldous Huxley calls "the false doctrine of totalitarian anthropocentrism and the pernicious ideas and practices of nationalistic pseudo-mysticism", Gandhi gave a new technique of spirituality in action.

SATYAGRAHA AS A MIRROR

Richard B. Gregg

On the faculty of the University of Wisconsin there is a psychiatrist, Dr Carl R. Rogers, who has spent many years giving counsel to people of many ages who are in personal emotional or mental trouble and cannot seem to solve their problems unaided. As a result of his professional experience he has come to believe that nobody will change his habits of thinking, feeling or acting until something happens to change his own picture or concept of himself. Other things being equal, for example, a student will give up preparing to become a journalist and begin to study for the law only when he can see himself as a practising lawyer. A thief will abandon that way of life only if he can see himself as happier in a different way of life and know how he can attain it. For most people, the matter of self-regard is of primary importance.

Dr Rogers's method of treating the person who comes to him for help is not the usual way of most mental physicians, of asking questions and then giving advice. No, he just suggests that the patient start to tell his story and explain his difficulties. Dr Rogers merely listens; makes no comments; tries never to judge by word, manner or tone of voice; offers no advice. Once in a while at a favourable moment he repeats something that the patient has just said, perhaps rephrasing it slightly. Suppose the patient is a boy with a very domineering father. The boy has told Dr Rogers a number of instances of that sort of domestic tyranny he has experienced, and finally, overcome with emotion, the boy bursts out, "I hate my father!" Dr Rogers might then calmly say, "You say that you have finally come to feel that you hate your father". The boy feels relieved by his confession, but wants to justify his feeling and so talks on. Later there will be another moment in which Dr Rogers repeats a statement by the boy, perhaps this time a happier statement. In this manner Dr Rogers holds up a mirror, as it were, to the patient, and lets him see himself in substantially his own words, but uttered as an echo by another person. The mirror is the repetition of the patient's own statement, reflected back to the patient without condemnation or approval or comment of any kind.

Dr Rogers finds that by this means the patient comes to see himself objectively, and the patient then can make his own comparisons more coolly, and gradually sees how to find his way out of his difficulties. Dr Rogers helps the patient thus to help himself. The first step has to be a change in the patient's own picture of himself. This is an interesting example of the power of the self-regarding attitude.

I would like to suggest that among the many aspects of satyagraha, it may be regarded as a sort of mirror held up to the opponent by the satyagrahi, and that this would be true of both individual and mass satyagraha. Furthermore, such a mirror seems to help the violent opponent to "cure" himself for some of the same reasons that Dr Rogers's method helps his patients to cure themselves. Let me elaborate on this idea.

Biologically speaking, man is a single species. There are, of course, different races, nations, tribes, castes and religions, and different individuals, but the similarities between people are deeper, wider, stronger, more enduring and more important than the differences. There is first a biological unity among people of all kinds. A man of any race, nation, caste or religion may marry a woman of any other race, nation, caste or religion and have children by her. Secondly, the young of human beings have a longer period of helplessness and learning than the young of any other species. This is what gives man his enormous power of learning. Thirdly, there is a physiological unity. We all have the same bony structure, nerves, blood circulation, lungs, heart and digestive organs. If any person of any race, nation, caste, or religion has an infected appendix, the surgeon operates him exactly the same way regardless of any superficial differences. If an Eskimo gets typhoid fever, the physician treats him just the same way as he treats a Negro who has typhoid fever. Fourthly, all people have some sort of language by means of which they cooperate and find meaning in life. All people have some sort of culture, some sort of tools, some sort of dress; they use some sort of symbols, believe in some sort of myths, and base their lives on some sort of assumptions. All people, regardless of superficial differences, have emotions—love, anger, fear, respect, hope, etc. These emotions may be called forth by different sights, events, or actions, but all people without exception, have emotions. All people have minds and use them. Their concepts, the contents of their minds, may differ, but thinking is common to all.

None of these considerations contradicts any belief as to the essential spiritual nature of mankind. But some people can see these aforesaid elements of human unity more easily, clearly and surely than they envisage spiritual unity.

Growing out of these several elements of human unity, we find that man is a gregarious and social creature, and we are at all times aware of and sensitive to the attitudes of other people around us. This awareness is not lessened in times of conflict, but is then rather enhanced. We are always eager for the approval, if possible, of our fellowmen. Writ large, this is the reason for the enormous amount of time, thought and work devoted to propaganda by all governments. Another recognition of this fact is the development within the past twenty years of "public relations" men employed by large corporations and even by universities, to make public explanations and propaganda for their employers. In private life we adhere to the customs of clothing, speech, food and festivals of our own social group, race or nation in order to retain their approval or at least tolerance.

When a conflict between two groups develops and gains enough intensity so that one group employs violence and, let us suppose, the other group offers satyagraha, the voluntary suffering of the satyagrahis is an appeal for recognition by all parties including the spectators, of the unity of all men. The suffering of the satyagrahis is, as it were, a mirror held up to the violent party, in which the violent ones come gradually to see themselves as violating that human unity and its implications. They see themselves as others see them. The attitude of the onlookers is another mirror. The satyagrahis do not shout at the violent party, "Now look at yourselves! We'll *make* you realize how unjust you are, what villains you are!" No, there is no such coercion by the satyagrahis.

It is the very human nature of the violent attackers themselves that compels their attention to what happens before them. They cannot escape for long the recognition of their common human unity. They will try to escape from or hide themselves from that unity, but as long as they are alive they cannot dodge the fact that they are of the same species as the satyagrahis. Nor can they blink the implications of that fact. The voluntary suffering of the satyagrahis is so unusual, so dramatic, so surprising, so wonder-provoking. Wonder naturally evokes curiosity and attention. And the desire of the violent party for approval of the onlookers draws attention to the contrast between the behaviour of the violent opponents and the behaviour of the satyagrahis. When the violent opponents see this contrast in the mirror which the situation has provided, they begin to get a different opinion of themselves. Then they sense the disapproval of the onlookers, and wanting social approval, they begin to search for ways to save their faces and yet change their actions so as to win that approval. This process is now taking place in the Southern States of the United States. Righting an ancient wrong takes time. It took Gandhi twenty-eight years to win freedom for India, and it will take time for the correction of the racial injustices in the United States. But all social processes move faster now than fifteen years ago, so we live in high hope that the nonviolent resistance of the American Negroes will soon win their struggle.

All this suggests that satyagraha operates at a level deeper than nationality, politics, military power, book education or socio-economic ideology. It is a process working in the very elemental human nature of mankind as a biological species. As satyagraha becomes more widely employed, it will, partly by virtue of this capacity as a mirror, help in the development of man's self-consciousness and confidence in his own capacities.

WHY DID GANDHI FAIL?

Kenneth E. Boulding

As a young man growing up in England I was enormously influenced by Gandhi and the whole idea of satyagraha and ahimsa, especially as interpreted, for instance, by writers such as Richard B. Gregg. Even after thirty years I can still recapture the sense of excitement, the sense that a great new idea had come into the world, an idea of enormous importance for mankind. Coming to adolescence in the aftermath of the first World War, I was conscious of the break-up of an old order, of the end of an old era. The whole world of national states and empires, which had seemed so secure and permanent in 1914, was revealed as incapable of providing a decent order and habitation for the human race. War seemed like an absolutely intolerable betrayal of the spirit of man, and the State which demanded it a monster only to be appeased by endless human sacrifice. On the other hand there seemed to be no alternative in the face of the very real conflicts of the world but a passive withdrawal, equally unacceptable to the spirit concerned with justice and the right ordering of society. In this dilemma the message of Gandhi came like a great light, indicating that it was possible to reconcile peace and justice, to reject war and at the same time participate in a great historical process for human betterment. The idea of a nonviolent struggle which refused to break the community of mankind, refused to exclude even the enemy from this community, and which rested on a view of human nature and of the social process much deeper than the crude arguments of the advocates of violence, was like a revelation. "Great was it in that dawn to be alive, and to be young was very heaven!"

"That dawn" for Wordsworth was the French Revolution, and a false dawn it turned out to be, a dawn not of liberation but of terrible violence and tyranny. Wordsworth's disillusion drove him to retreat into a barren conservatism in later life, and one can hope not to repeat this. No doubt all dawns are false, or rather, each dawn leads only to another day; the great tides of human history submerge the momentary waves of excitement and exaltation. Nevertheless it is hard to avoid a sense of disappointment at the grey day that followed the Gandhian dawn. The second World War was nothing unexpected: it was implicit in the very system of national power. The independence of India likewise was not unexpected, for we had all looked forward to it for years. Some of us hoped indeed that India, because of Gandhi, would be a new kind of nation, rejecting the whole system of threats and counter-threats which had brought the world to disaster. What has happened since 1947 however has been profoundly disturbing for those of us who held these high hopes.

For what has happened? India has become a nation like any other, and even, truth compels me to say with pain, less mature in its foreign relations, less peaceful, less realistic, than many others. In its internal policies there is one outstanding achievement, the maintenance of internal freedom and democracy in the face of enormous problems and difficulties. I happened to witness the military parade in New Delhi on 26 January 1964 on my way to the Pugwash Conference in Udaipur. I felt as if I was back in the Europe of 1914, and hardly knew whether to laugh or weep. It was as if Gandhi had never lived or had lived in vain. I confess I never expected to live to see girls in saris doing the goose-step! It is very hard for Indians now to see how they look to the world outside, for they are naturally preoccupied with their enormous internal problems. It is very easy, however, for India's actions to be interpreted as those of a weak and petulant bully, not hesitating to use the old-fashioned threat against a weak enemy, as in Goa, answering provocation with provocation in the case of a strong enemy, such as China, and refusing to make a desperately needed adjustment in the case of Kashmir. I am not saying that this image of India is either true or just, merely that it is a possible interpretation of India's actions. What is abundantly clear is that India's international posture is an enormous handicap in achieving economic development, a handicap so great that it may prevent development altogether, and may have in it the seeds of a human catastrophe on an almost unimaginable scale. The problem of development in a country like India, burdened with a tradition and a religion which for many centuries has produced a heroic adjustment to poverty rather than to a sober and organized attempt to get out of poverty, is so difficult in itself that it requires every ounce of human effort, of talent for organization, and of economic resources to break out of the trap. Every man, every rupee wasted in military effort is a millstone round India's neck, and may condemn billions of her unborn to poverty and misery. Economic development is like a man trying to jump out of a ten-foot hole; it is no use his jumping nine feet eleven inches, for he will just fall back. At a certain crucial stage a little more effort may make the whole difference between ultimate success and failure. What are we to say, therefore, to a man who tries to jump out of this hole with a cannon deliberately strapped on his back—yet is not this precisely descriptive of India today!

The plain and ugly truth is that in the game of international politics India is going to be a militarily weak nation for many decades to come. In the modern world especially, with the United Nations and the increasing recognition of the illegitimacy of war, it is quite possible for a weak nation to survive and prosper, and indeed eventually become a "strong" one for whatever that may be worth, which is not much. When it is weak, however, it must behave like a weak nation, and not pretend that it is a strong one. Both India and Indonesia—the latter much more so—seem to be under the illusion that because they are big nations they must, therefore, simply because of their large populations, be powerful. Nothing could be farther from the truth—their very size is a major source of their weakness, for in the modern world small nations have a much better chance of managing their internal affairs well and getting on the road to development than large nations. It is a fatal mistake, however, for a weak nation to behave as if it were a strong one, which seems to me precisely what India is doing.

Quite apart from Gandhian moral standards, then, and even judged by the low morality of international power politics, India is behaving badly and gets a low mark. The child born with such high hopes has turned out not only to be no better than the average, but actually worse. There are, of course, many extenuating circumstances. Colonial rule is a dreadful thing, which corrupts both ruler and ruled, and the ex-colonial countries all suffer from a well-recognised disease of society which might be called the "post-colonial trauma", and from which it may take several generations to recover—indeed, I sometimes think the trouble with England even today is that it never really recovered from the Norman conquest, for it too exhibits many of the marks of a post-colonial society! It takes time to learn mature international behaviour, and the nations—including my own—are all busy teaching each other how to be immature and childish, and learning this lesson all too readily. Still, the nagging question remains: India, because a new light shone into the world there, should have been different—or perhaps one should have expected Gandhi to suffer the fate of the Buddha! A prophet, as the Christian Bible says, is not without honour save in his own country!

For those concerned with the theory of nonviolence the failure of Gandhism in India to produce a successful development process after the "revolutionary" change raises severe problems. Nonviolence remains a powerful instrument of revolutionary change—as we see now, indeed, in the movement of Martin Luther King in the United States. It perhaps has a greater effect on those against whom it is used than on those who use it. In a very real sense Gandhi liberated Britain more than he liberated India; when I go back to Britain I am astonished at how much richer and happier a country it seems to be than the "Imperial" England of my childhood. In spite of the damage and sufferings of the wars, and though Gandhi can hardly be given all the credit for this, the plain economic fact is that in the twentieth century empire became a burden to the imperial power, not a source of wealth or even power. It is hard, however, to cast aside even burdens willingly, as the case of Portugal (the poorest country in Europe, with the largest empire) indicates. Nonviolence indeed is only effective when it is aligned with truth—ahimsa and satyagraha must go hand in hand. When truth is rejected, and when an illusory view of the world clouds the judgement, as it seems to me is true of India today, of course nonviolence will be rejected. The critical problem then, comes down to how we learn to test the reality of our images of social and political systems, for the greatest enemy of nonviolence is the lack of "reality testing". Even violence can be interpreted as a crude and costly method of testing our images of the world—as, for instance, Japan and Germany discovered by violent defeat that their images of the world had been wrong.

Thus, the failure of Gandhism is not a failure of ahimsa, but a failure of satyagraha. The modern world is so complex that the truth about it cannot be perceived by common sense or by mystical insight, important as these things are. We must have the more delicate and quantitative sampling and processing of information provided by the methods of the social sciences if we are really to test the truth of our images of social and political systems. The next logical step, therefore, for the Gandhian movement would seem to be in the direction of the social sciences, in peace research, and in the testing of all our images of society by the more refined means for discovering truth which are now available to us. I am not suggesting, of course, that the social sciences produce "absolute" truth, or indeed that much valid perception is not achieved through common sense and insight. What I do suggest, however, is that the problem of truth is so difficult that we cannot afford to neglect any means of improving the path towards it, and that without this, nonviolence will inevitably be frustrated.

Everywhere I went in India in my brief and inadequate visits I heard one thing: "There is no alternative". It was precisely the greatness of Gandhi that he always insisted there *was* an alternative. Morality always implies that there are alternatives to choose, for morality is choice. To deny alternatives is to deny morality itself. To perceive alternatives requires imagination, hard thinking, and costly and painstaking study. If the Gandhian movement in India can recapture this great vision of the alternative, India may yet be saved from the disaster towards which she seems to be heading.

SECTION THREE

GANDHI'S POLITICAL SIGNIFICANCE TODAY

Gene Sharp

On 30 January 1948 on his way to prayers Gandhi was assassinated, killed by three bullets in his abdomen and chest. The young assassin was a fanatical Hindu who among others had been inflamed by Gandhi's efforts to bring reconciliation between Hindus and Muslims in riot-torn independent India. After a year of bloody strife, Gandhi's fast had brought peace to Calcutta and all Bengal. Later, sensing an incendiary situation under the surface, he fasted the last time in Delhi and restored an atmosphere of peace. For these and similar acts, he was not loved by all. In Calcutta a mob attacked his residence, a brick was thrown at him, and someone swung a heavy bamboo rod (lathi) at his head, Both narrowly missed. During his Delhi fast some shouted outside his quarters, "Let Gandhi die!" A week before his death, a small home-made bomb was thrown at him from a nearby garden during afternoon prayers.

With those three bullets came the bitter fruit of the murder of an important political leader. India and the world were saddened. Political leaders and ordinary people alike felt a personal loss.

In the years which have passed since that January day, many important events have taken place which have altered the world significantly: the death of Stalin, the Communist victory in China, the development of the hydrogen bomb and intercontinental missiles, the Hungarian Revolution, the trial of Eichmann, the end of the British and French colonial empires, President Kennedy's assassination, and the "Negro Revolution" in the United States, to list only a few.

After such events in a world in which history now moves so quickly, does Gandhi still have any political significance? Now, with the passing of years and the opportunity for a more distant perspective, how is Gandhi to be evaluated? Are there points at which our earlier judgment must be revised?

For a Westerner—and perhaps particularly for an American—Gandhi poses special problems in such an evaluation. Often his eccentricities get in the way so that it is difficult to get beyond them, or to take other aspects of his life seriously. Even for religious people in the West, his constant use of religious terminology and theological language in explanation or justification of a social or political act or policy more often confuses than clarifies.

The homage which most pay to him by calling him "Mahatma"—the great-souled one—usually becomes a kind of vaccination against taking him seriously. If he was such a saint and holy man, it is thought, this is a full explanation of his accomplishments; we need investigate no further. As a Mahatma, he can be revered while being placed in that special category of saints, prophets and holy men whose lives and actions are believed to be largely irrelevant to ordinary men.

It is sometimes the case that Gandhi's own candid evaluations of himself and his work now appear to be more accurate than the opinions of some of his followers and the homage-bearers. "I claim", he once wrote, "to be no more than an average man with less than average ability". Indeed, in important respects this was probably true. He only went to South Africa after having failed in his attempt to be a lawyer in India.

Nor was he pleased at the homage given him, although he cherished the affection of people where it was genuine. "My Mahatmaship is worthless", he once wrote. "I have become literally sick of the adoration of the unthinking multitude." "I lay no claim to superhuman powers. I want none. I wear the same corruptible flesh that the weakest of my fellow-beings wears, and am, therefore, as liable to err as any."

There are further difficulties in evaluating Gandhi. These include widespread misrepresentations of Gandhi and his political opinions. These misrepresentations are not usually deliberate, but often are made by people who have just not made a detailed study of Gandhi's views on the point in question. It is, for example, widely claimed that Gandhi approved of Indian military action in Kashmir, that he would have approved of the Indian invasion of Goa, and even that he would have supported the present nuclear weapons program.

Such misrepresentations are not only made by Westerners, but commonly by educated Indians who often assume, because they are Indians, have read newspaper reports and repeatedly discussed Gandhi, that they know what they are talking about. Gandhi's own scepticism about the degree of understanding of his nonviolence and views among Western-educated Indians continues to be verified.

Part of the difficulties in understanding Gandhi's views on such questions as these has its roots in the attempt to fit Gandhi into our usual categories. It is, for example, assumed often that he must fit the traditional view of a pacifist or that he is a supporter of military action. When he asserts the existence of political evil which must be resisted, many people assume that he thereby "of necessity" has supported violence.

Gandhi's thinking was constantly developing, and early in his career he did give certain qualified support to war. But at the end of his life this had altered. But this did *not* mean he favoured passivity. Thus, while believing the Allies to be the better side in the Second World War, he did not support the war. Similarly in Kashmir, while believing the Pakistanis to be the aggressors, and while believing that India must act, he did *not* favour military action.

Instead he placed his confidence in the application of an alternative nonviolent means of struggle against political evil. Here he was constantly experimenting, and his advocacy of the efficacy of nonviolent action in crises was not always convincing to the hard-headed realists. This sometimes meant—as at the time of Kashmir—that he was not politically "effective". But that is quite different from claiming that he had rejected his own nonviolent means.

As we shall note later in more detail, it was Gandhi's primary contribution, not only to argue for, but to develop practically nonviolent means of struggle in politics for those situations in which war and other types of political violence were usually used. His work here was pioneering, and sometimes inadequate, but it was sufficient to put him outside the traditional categories. Gandhi was neither a conscientious objector nor a supporter of violence in politics. He was an experimenter in the development of "war without violence".

A final confusion handicaps our attempt to evaluate Gandhi. His politics are sometimes assumed to be identical with those of the independent Indian Government under Nehru. Although Nehru has long had a very deep regard for Gandhi, and although Gandhi cooperated with the Indian National Congress in the long struggle for independence, the policies which Gandhi favoured are not necessarily those of the Congress government today.

Indeed, saddened by the riots between Hindus and Muslims and busy in Calcutta seeking to restore peace, Gandhi refused to attend the Independence ceremony and celebrations on 15 August 1947. The riots saddened him both for their own sake and because he believed they reflected a weakness in Indian society which could bring India again under foreign domination by one of the Big Three (which included China).

Gandhi had opposed partition into Pakistan and India. Congress leaders had accepted it. His plea for nonviolent resistance in Kashmir with nonviolent assistance from India was ignored. Gandhi had dreamt that a free India would be able to defend her freedom without military means. Yet in the provisional government before independence, and in the fully independent government, military expenditure and influence increased, while Gandhi warned of the danger of military rule and of India's possible future threat to world peace. Her freedom could be defended nonviolently, Gandhi insisted, just as by nonviolent means the great British Empire had been forced to withdraw.

Political independence had not brought real relief to the peasants, who Gandhi had said ought nonviolently to seize and occupy the land, and even to exercise political power.

Gandhi's picture and name are widely used by the Congress Party in election campaigns. Yet Gandhi had written: "We must recognize the fact that the social order of our dreams cannot come through the Congress Party of today. . . . " The day before his assassination he drafted a proposal for abolishing the Congress as it had existed and suggested a constitution for converting it into an association for voluntary work to build a nonviolent society and guide India's development from outside the government.

Gandhi must be evaluated on the basis of his own outlook and his own policies, not those of others. And it is also important that we re-examine some of the views about Gandhi and the nonviolent struggle which he led which are widespread in the West. In large degree these are views which have masqueraded as "realistic" assessments. I suggest, however, that as we shall see these views are often contrary to the facts and may be more akin to rationalization which help one to avoid considering Gandhi and the Indian experiments seriously. Let us look at six of these a bit more closely.

Outside of India, during and for some years after the Indian nonviolent liberation struggle, it was widely said that such nonviolence was simply a characteristic of Indians who were presumed to be, for various reasons, incapable of violence. The implication of this was that the Indian experiments with nonviolent action deserved very little further analysis. For fairly obvious reasons this assumption that Indians were incapable of violence for political ends is almost never heard any longer. But the implications of this altered view are likewise almost never explored.

It is forgotten (except in India) that the 1857-59 Indian War of Independence—which the English called the "Mutiny"—ever occurred, and this included not only guerrilla campaigns but full-scale battles. In the late 19th and early 20th centuries a terrorist movement developed among Indian nationalists (especially in Maharashtra, Bengal and the Punjab) which was responsible for a number of assassinations by bombings and shootings. Even after Gandhi was actively on the scene, the terrorists continued their actions. For example, as late as 1929 bombs were thrown and shots were fired in the Legislative Assembly in New Delhi. At the end of that year a bomb exploded under the train carrying the Viceroy, Lord Irwin (later known as Lord Halifax when he was British Foreign Secretary and Ambassador to the United States). And that was not the end of the terrorist movement.

Subhas Chandra Bose by 1928 had achieved an impressive following with his cry of "Give me blood and I promise you freedom". That year both he and Jawaharlal Nehru (later a supporter of Gandhi's methods) favoured an immediate declaration of independence to be followed by a war of independence.

Bose was President of the Indian National Congress in 1938 and was elected at the 1939 convention though he then resigned under pressure from Gandhi. During World War II, Bose headed the "Indian National Army" and fought on the side of the Japanese capturing the imagination of a significant section of the Indian public.

The religious riots prior to and after Independence are well known. Thousands were killed. Five millions migrated across the new borders of India and Pakistan. There were well-grounded fears of war—first civil war, and later between the newly independent countries. Troops faced each other in Kashmir.

During the Sino-Indian border conflict, it became unmistakably clear that when faced with a crisis affecting its frontiers the Indian Government was prepared to involve itself in large-scale military preparations. By and large the Indian people shared this reaction. Indeed, the most vocal critics of the government felt that it was not being sufficiently ready to go to war. The indications of the Indian invasion of Goa and the war in Nagaland, that the Indian government was ready to use military force, were emphatically confirmed. This was as Gandhi had expected. The Indian Government had demonstrated that when it came to military defence, it differed little in its basic approach from other governments.

Indeed, it can be expected that when China gets nuclear weapons, India will not be far behind, despite her non-alignment policy and Nehru's aversion to such means.

All these facts should make it quite clear that the Indians have all along been quite capable of using violent means, and that there must have been something special which led them to rely on nonviolent struggle as the main strategy for achieving independence.

It is of course true that there were elements in Indian religions and traditions which were conducive to Gandhi's approach, and that as Gandhi drew upon these and spoke in their language, the religious peasants understood him. The most important of these was probably the principle of ahimsa, which roughly meant non-injury to living things in thought, word, and deed. These elements were doubtless important, but, as we shall note later, when Gandhi drew upon them, he always gave them new and vital interpretations.

But just as there are in Western civilization traditions and principles counteracting the Christian principle of love for one's enemies, so in Indian religions and traditions there were also counteracting principles. Sikhs and Muslims, for example, believed in military prowess. And the Hindu caste system itself provided for a warrior caste. The *Bhagavad-Gita*—which Gandhi so revered and which he re-interpreted symbolically—related the story of physical warfare and dwelt upon the justification for fighting.

In the light of these various evidences of the Indians being willing to use violence in political struggles, the view that the Indian independence struggle was predominantly nonviolent because Indians were incapable of approving of violence collapses.

While for strategic reasons a full-scale war with traditional front-lines might not have been possible, a major guerrilla war certainly would have been feasible. (Assuming that the percentage of casualties in proportion to the total population would have been about the same in such a struggle in India as later proved to be the case in Algeria, that would have meant between 3,000,000 and 3,500,000 Indian dead. The estimate of Indians killed or who died from injuries incurred while participating in the nonviolent struggle given by Richard Gregg is about 8,000. One cannot claim that the French are by nature so much more cruel than the English!)

Thus, rather than Indian nonviolence being entirely natural and inevitable, it is clear that Gandhi deserves considerable credit in getting nonviolent action accepted as the technique of struggle in the grand strategy for the liberation movement. It is clear that this acceptance by the Indian National Congress was not a moral or religious act. It was a political act which was possible because Gandhi offered a course of action which was nonviolent but which above all was seen to be practical and effective.

It is widely believed that Gandhi was simply a personification of Indian traditions. As we have pointed out, however, and as has been amply demonstrated by Dr Joan Bondurant of the University of California, wherever Gandhi drew upon traditional Indian concepts, he gave them a fresh and vital interpretation which differed significantly from the original. At the same time, it is usually forgotten how un-Indian Gandhi was in many ways. He openly in words and actions defied widely accepted traditions and orthodoxies. His fight against untouchability which he undertook several decades ago when it was many times more entrenched than today is simply an example. His whole experimental approach to life and to politics (he called his autobiography, "The Story of My Experiments with Truth") has overtones of influence by Western science.

Gandhi's basic assumption that one must not "accept" or "understand" evil but *fight* it, although supported by some, also was in diametrical opposition to other schools of Hindu philosophy which held that one must not fight evil, but transcend it, seeing the conflict between good and evil as something which ultimately contributes to a higher development, and hence about which one ought not to be particularly concerned.

Gandhi's activity and sense of struggle not only challenged (or ignored) those schools of Hindu thought. They went contrary to widely established patterns of actual behaviour. Passivity and submission were such common traits among Indians of his day that Gandhi found frequently that these qualities, not the British, were the main enemy blocking the way to independence. Gandhi is widely credited with a major influence in their reduction and replacement by action, determination and courageous self-reliance.

"Nonviolence", wrote Gandhi in 1920, "does not mean meek submission to the will of the evil-doer, but it means the pitting of one's whole soul against the will of the tyrant. . . . And so I am not pleading for India to practise nonviolence because she is weak. I want her to practise nonviolence being conscious of her strength and power."

A third popular view of Gandhi and the Indian struggle has been especially expounded by Marxists. They have frequently argued that Gandhi's nonviolent action had little or nothing to do with the British leaving India, but that they did so because it was no longer profitable for them to hold on to the subcontinent.

These Marxists often demonstrate their ignorance of Gandhi and his nonviolent action by their assumption that these had nothing to do with reduced economic benefits to the British rulers. This assumed separation is manifestly untrue. The new spirit of resistance and independence among the Indians to which Gandhi contributed, in turn increased the difficulties and expense of maintaining the British Raj, especially during the major non-cooperation and civil disobedience campaigns.

But even in purely economic terms of trade with India, Gandhi's program had a significant impact. This is particularly demonstrated by the impact of the boycott during the 1930-31 civil disobedience campaign. This coincided with the world depression, but as will be demonstrated, the drop in purchases of British goods by India was not solely the result of that depression but significantly also attributable to the boycott programme.

The British Secretary of State for India, in the House of Commons in late 1930 (according to J. C. Kumarappa) credited the general depression with a 25 per cent fall in the export trade to India, and credited the balance of 18 per cent in the fall directly to the boycott programme carried on by the Indian National Congress. Total British exports to India according to statistical abstracts declined (in millions of pounds sterling) from 90.6 in 1924, to 85.0 by 1927, then to 78.2 in 1929 and in the boycott year, 1930, to 52.9.

The total import of cotton piece-goods by India from all countries rose from 1.82 billion yards in 1924 to 1.94 billion yards in 1929 and declined only to 1.92 billion yards in 1930. However, the *British* export of the same commodity to India fell from 1.25 billion yards in 1924 to 1.08 billion yards in 1929—a decline of 14 per cent. Then it fell to 0.72 billion yards in 1930—a decline of 42.4 per cent. Between October 1930 and April 1931, when the boycott was at its height, there was a decline of 84 per cent.

This is, of course, no attempt to evaluate the variety of specific factors influencing the achievement of political independence by India. But this should make it clear that the Marxist view that economic factors were completely separate from Gandhi's nonviolent action is not based on facts.

A fourth view, often expressed by political "realists", is that Gandhi's nonviolent action is incapable of wielding effective political power, and is hence irrelevant for practical politicians. This view frequently presumes both naivete on Gandhi's part and that the kind of action he proposed was impotent and no real threat to a political opponent. Neither of these presumptions is borne out by the facts.

Some of Gandhi's statements at the beginning of the 1930-31 civil disobedience campaign are enlightening. "The British people must realize that the Empire is to come to an end. This they will not realize unless we in India have generated power within to enforce our will." "It is not a matter of carrying conviction by argument. The matter resolves itself into one of matching forces. Conviction or no conviction, Great Britain would defend her Indian commerce and interests by all the forces at her command. India must consequently evolve force enough to free herself from that embrace of death." "The English nation responds only to force." I was a believer in the politics of petitions, deputations and friendly negotiations. But all these have gone to dogs. I know that these are not the ways to bring this Government round. Sedition has become my religion. Ours is a nonviolent battle."

Rather than being ignorant of the need to wield political power, Gandhi sought to exercise it in ways which maximized the Indian strength and weakened that of the British. By withdrawing the cooperation and obedience of the subjects, Gandhi sought to cut off important sources of the rulers' power. At the same time the non-cooperation and disobedience created severe enforcement problems. And in this situation, severe repression against nonviolent people would be likely, not to strengthen the government, but to alienate still more Indians from the British Raj and at the same time create—not unity in face of an enemy but dissent and opposition at home.

This was thus a kind of political jiu jitsu which generated the maximum Indian strength while using British strength to their own disadvantage. "I believe, and everybody must grant", wrote Gandhi, "that no Government can exist for a single moment without the cooperation of the people, willing or forced, and if people suddenly withdraw their cooperation in every detail, the Government will come to a standstill."

The view that Gandhi was ignorant of the realities of political power and that his technique of action was impotent would have been vigorously denied by every British Government and Viceroy that had to deal with him and his movement.

In a most revealing address to both Houses of the Indian Legislative Assembly in July 1930, the Viceroy, Lord Irwin declared: "In my judgment and in that of my Government it [the civil disobedience movement] is a deliberate attempt to coerce established authority by mass action, and. . . it must be regarded as unconstitutional and dangerously subversive. Mass action, even if it is intended by its promotors to be nonviolent, is nothing but the application of force under another form, and when it has as its avowed object the making of Government impossible, a Government is bound either to resist or abdicate." "So long as the Civil Disobedience Movement persists, we must fight it with all our strength." Apparently the political "realist" who has dismissed Gandhi and his technique has some re-thinking to do.

A fifth very common view, especially in Britain and among some Indians, is that Gandhi's nonviolent campaigns were only possible because the opponent was a British Government who were, of course, only very gentlemanly. While this has an element of truth in it, the degree of validity is almost always exceeded so that rather than this being a useful contribution to an analysis of the events, it becomes a means of dismissing those events without thought.

Admittedly, the British were not nearly so ruthless as Hitler or Stalin would have been, but they were far more brutal in repression than is today remembered. People not only suffered seriously in foul prisons and prison camps, but literally had their skulls cracked in beatings with steel-shod bamboo rods (lathis) and were shot while demonstrating. In a more famous and grave case, the shooting at Jalianwala Bagh in Amritsar, unarmed Indians holding a peaceful meeting were without warning fired upon. According to the Hunter Commission 379 were killed and 1,137 wounded.

If the British exercised some restraint in dealing with the nonviolent rebellion, this may be more related to the peculiar problems posed by a nonviolent resistance movement and to the kind of forces which the nonviolence set in motion, than to the opponent being "British". The same people showed little restraint in dealing with the Mau Mau in Kenya, or in the saturation bombings of Germans cities.

It is interesting that Hitler saw no chance of a successful nonviolent or violent revolt in India against British rule. "We Germans have learned well enough how hard it is to force England", he wrote in *Mein Kampf*.

The view that nonviolent action could only be effective against the British was more credible in the days when the Indian experiments were the main example of nonviolent action for political objectives. Now that this is no longer true and the technique has spread to other parts of the world under a variety of political circumstances—as we shall shortly note—including Nazi and Communist rule, more careful examination of the circumstances for effectiveness is required.

The last popular view which we shall examine is this: Nonviolent action for political ends is only practical under the particular set of circumstances which prevailed in India during Gandhi's time. People outside India interpret this to mean that nonviolent action is impractical for them, and Indians mean that whereas it once was practical for them, it no longer is. Sometimes, the view is even more specific: that such nonviolent action is only possible for people who share the peculiar Hindu religious outlook.

This last view is repudiated by the Indian experience itself. Among the most courageous and consistent of the nonviolent

Indian freedom fighters were the Muslim Pathans of the rebellious and never fully conquered North-West Frontier Province. These men, with a long tradition of military prowess and skill in war, quickly became under the leadership of Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan expert and brave practitioners of nonviolent struggle.

Although this is not our main concern, it should be noted that there are Indians who believe that nonviolent action is still possible in India. There has been a considerable use of the technique domestically since independence, and there are exponents of its use in place of military resistance in dealing with any possible invasion, as by China or Pakistan, although it is true that detailed preparations have not been completed for meeting such an eventuality.

□

One of the most remarkable developments of the twentieth century has been the development and spread of the technique of nonviolent action. Nonviolent action includes the types of behaviour known as nonviolent resistance, satyagraha, nonviolent direct action, and the large variety of specific methods of action, such as strikes, boycotts, political non-cooperation, civil disobedience, nonviolent obstruction, etc. This technique has a long history, but because historians have been more concerned with violent conflicts and wars than with nonviolent struggles, much information has been lost.

In modern times the technique initially received impetus from three main groups: (1) social radicals, such as trade unionists, anarchists, syndicalists and socialists, who sought a means of struggle—largely strikes, general strikes and boycotts—for use against what they regarded as an unjust social system; (2) nationalists who found the technique useful in resisting a foreign enemy (such as the Hungarian resistance versus Austria, 1850-1867, and the Chinese anti-Japanese boycotts); and (3) individuals, both pacifist and non-pacifist, who were pointing a way by which a new society might be achieved (such as Leo Tolstoy in Russia, Henry David Thoreau in America, Gustav Landauer in Germany, etc.)

Little serious attention was given, however, to refining and improving the technique, to the development of its strategy, tactics and methods of action. Neither was it linked with a general programme of social change. The technique remained essentially passive, the action being in most cases a reaction to the initiative of the opponent.

While religious groups, such as the early Quakers, had practised nonviolent action as a reaction to persecution, the link between the moral qualities of nonviolence and the technique of action in social and political struggles was rarely made, except by individuals such as Tolstoy, and even then remained on the level of ideas.

It remained for Gandhi to make the most significant political experiments to that time in the use of non-cooperation, disobedience and defiance to control rulers, alter policies and undermine political systems.

With Gandhi's experiments with the technique, its character was broadened and refinements made. Conscious efforts were now made in developing the strategy and tactics. The number of specific forms or methods of action was enlarged. He linked it with a programme of social change, and the building of new institutions.

Nonviolent action became not passive resistance, but a technique capable of taking the initiative in active struggle. A link was forged between a means of mass struggle and a moral preference for nonviolent means, although for participants this preference was not necessarily absolutist in character.

This technique Gandhi called satyagraha, which is best translated as the firmness which comes from reliance on truth, and truth here has connotations of essence of being. A rather philosophical term, perhaps, but this technique was in Gandhi's view based on firm political reality and one of the most fundamental of all insights into the nature of government—that all rulers in fact are dependent for their power on the submission, cooperation and obedience of their subjects. "In politics, its use is based upon the immutable maxim that government of the people is possible only so long as they consent either consciously or unconsciously to be governed."

Following the widespread experiments under Gandhi, this technique of nonviolent action spread throughout the world at a rate previously unequalled. In some cases this was directly and indirectly stimulated by the Gandhian experiments. Where this was so, it was often modified in new cultural and political settings. In these cases, the technique has already moved beyond Gandhi.

One of the most important instances of this development is of course the adoption of nonviolent action in the American Negro struggle against racial segregation and discrimination. This was a possibility envisaged by Gandhi, as he revealed in conversations with visiting American Negroes. In 1937 Dr Channing Tobias and Dr Benjamin Mays visited Gandhi, and asked him what advice they might relay from him to the American Negroes, and what he saw as the outlook for the future of their struggle.

Gandhi called nonviolent action the way "of the strong and wise", and added: "With right which is on their side and the choice of nonviolence as their only weapon, if they will make it such, a bright future is assured."

Earlier, in 1936, Gandhi told Dr and Mrs Howard Thurman that "it may be through the Negroes that the unadulterated message of nonviolence will be delivered to the world".

Contemporaneously with the spread of Gandhi-inspired nonviolent action in other parts of the world, there emerged in Communist countries and Nazi-occupied countries independent demonstrations of the technique under exceedingly difficult circumstances.

While no totalitarian system has been overthrown by nonviolent action, there has been more such resistance than is generally recognised. In these cases the fact that the resistance was nonviolent often seemed almost an accident, often without any conscious choice and certainly not the result of moral or religious qualms about violence. Often the nonviolent action even accompanied violence or was tinged with violence, but nevertheless remained basically dependent upon the nonviolent solidarity in noncooperation and defiance of men and women acting without external arms.

The Norwegian resistance during the Nazi occupation is perhaps the most significant case. It was largely through such resistance that Quisling's plans for establishing the Corporate State in Norway were thwarted. The heroism of the Norwegian teachers in refusing to indoctrinate school children with the National Socialist ideology or to become part of the fascist teachers' "corporation" is perhaps the best known part of this resistance. But it is by no means the only one. Clergymen, sportsmen, trade unionists and others played their part too.

Other important cases include: major aspects of the Danish Resistance, 1940-45, including the successful general strike in Copenhagen in 1944; major aspects of the Dutch Resistance, 1940-45, including large-scale strikes in 1941, 1943 and 1944; the East German Rising of June 1953, in which there was massive nonviolent defiance including women in Jena sitting down in front of Russian tanks; strikes in the political prisoners' camps (especially at Vorkuta) in the Soviet Union in 1953, which are credited with being a major influence for improving the lot of the prisoners; and major aspects of the Hungarian Revolution, 1956-57 in which in addition to the military battles there was demonstrated the power of the general strike, and large-scale popular nonviolent defiance. Also, the impact of popular pressure in Poland for liberalising the regime was considerable despite the difficulties.

The degree of "success" and "failure" varies in such cases. These instances have occurred without advance preparations, with neither serious thought nor training nor preparation for such action. These cases are nevertheless significant, for they prove something that is often denied: that nonviolent action is possible under at least certain circumstances against a totalitarian system and that in certain conditions such action can force concessions and win at least partial victories.

In some circumstances such action may lead—and has led in Denmark, East Germany and Hungary, for example—to increasing unreliability of the regime's own troops, administration and other agents. Mutiny is simply the extreme form of this.

Other significant developments of nonviolent action have taken place in various parts of Africa, Japan, South Vietnam and elsewhere. The process is continuing.

Already this technique has moved very far from its role in politics when Gandhi first began his experiments with it in South Africa, and later in India. Contrary to the former situation, now for the first time people and some social scientists operating as yet with the most meagre resources are attempting to study this technique, and to learn of its nature, its dynamics, the requirements for success with it against various types of opponents, and to examine its future potentialities.

The view that this technique can only be used in the peculiar Indian circumstances at the time of Gandhi is thus seen also to be one which has little basis in fact. Indeed, it was argued a long time ago by an Indian sociologist, Krishnalal Shridharani, in his doctoral thesis at Columbia University (and later in his book, *War Without Violence*) that the West was more suitable than India for the technique: "My contact with the Western world has led me to think that, contrary to popular belief, satyagraha, once consciously and deliberately adopted, has more fertile fields in which to grow and flourish in the West than in the Orient. Like war, satyagraha demands public spirit, self-sacrifice, organization, endurance and discipline for its successful operation, and I have found these qualities displayed in Western communities more than my own. Perhaps the best craftsmen in the art of violence may still be the most effective wielders of nonviolent direct action."

This view has in the intervening years become not only more credible but one for which there is increasing supporting evidence. This is supported by an elementary examination of a large number of cases of nonviolent action which reveals that, contrary to popular belief and the rather conceited assumption of pacifists, in an overwhelming number of such cases leaders and followers have both been non-pacifists who have followed the nonviolent means for some limited social, economic or political objective. This has profound implications.

Thus Gandhi emerges, along with the technique of action, to the development of which he contributed so significantly, as being important for the world as a whole. Gandhi and nonviolent action clearly can no longer be pigeon-holed and dismissed without serious consideration by informed people.

Gandhi's role in politics was rather peculiar. He was not a student of politics, as we would think of one. He was not a political theoretician or analyst. Nor was he inclined to write, and perhaps was not capable of writing, a systematic treatise on his approach to politics. These were serious weaknesses and have continued to have important consequences. Indeed, he admitted that he could not lay claim to "much book knowledge".

Yet, despite this Gandhi was an innovator in politics. He often demonstrated that despite his lack of political "book knowledge" he had a very considerable understanding of political realities. He relied upon this and his intuition, as well as his constant "experiments". He had a capacity to sense the feelings and capacities of ordinary people about political issues, clearly understanding the peasants better than his more intellectual fellow nationalists.

His capacity to inspire people to act bravely and to gain a new sense of their capacities was combined with great organizational ability and attention to details. The combination of these various factors resulted in his important contributions to the development of "the politics of nonviolent action". Dr S. Radhakrishnan, now President of India, wrote in his introduction to the Unesco edition of Gandhi's writings that "Gandhi was the first in human history to extend the principle of nonviolence from the individual to the social and political plane".

This development which has taken place side by side with the most extreme forms of political violence—typified by the Hitler and Stalin regimes and by nuclear weapons—has led some people to ask whether the solution to such violence is developing while the problem is becoming more acute.

After the achievement of political independence, the new Indian Government did not—as Gandhi had hoped—assert its confidence in nonviolent means to defend the newly won freedom. The assumption of some pacifists that after experience with nonviolent action people would rather easily adopt the whole "gospel" was not borne out. Although Gandhi had hoped to the contrary he had expected independent India to have its army.

The Indian nationalists were willing to adopt the nonviolent course of action which Gandhi proposed to achieve political freedom, but when the struggle was won, they did not automatically continue their adherence to nonviolent means. This was a somewhat natural and predictable development.

This is because the adoption by India of the nonviolent struggle to deal with British imperialism was not a doctrinal or a moralistic act. It was a political act in response to a political programme of action proposed to deal with a particular kind of situation and crisis. A distinguished Muslim President of the Indian National Congress, Maulana Azad, once said: "The Indian National Congress is not a moral organization to achieve world peace but a political body to acquire freedom from the foreign yoke."

Thus, for most Indian nationalists, it happened, almost parenthetically, that this nonviolent programme offered by Gandhi was morally preferable to violent revolutionary war.

In addition to strategic and tactical advantages, this choice of nonviolent means in some ways increased the strength of the movement by giving it an aura of moral superiority. It was also probably psychologically and morally more uplifting to the society as a whole and to individual participants. But these were certainly not the prime factors determining its acceptance.

In this new situation in which independent India no longer followed his nonviolence, Gandhi was unsure about the best way to proceed, except that he was convinced of the importance of having people who believed in "the nonviolence of the brave and the strong" out of moral convictions. He was so busy with the riots and other problems that he did not work out a satisfactory solution to the new problem before his assassination.

In the years after, the Gandhians were for some time uncertain as to how to proceed. When they gained a strong sense of direction it was to follow the initiatives of Vinoba Bhave and the land-gift and associated movements for social and economic reform which he launched. Vinoba, however, is a very different person from Gandhi and is often content with broad generalizations where detailed policies are needed.

When he launched the Shanti Sena, or Peace Army, of a core of volunteers committed to the development of alternative nonviolent ways of dealing with the tasks normally assigned to the police and soldiers, the programme was not worked out in such a way (as Gandhi had done) to appeal to the hard-headed realist and the political leaders. There are now—with the shock of the

Indian Government's actions in Goa and the Chinese border—signs of new life within it, but the Shanti Sena still is far from adequately developed.

Meanwhile, the Indian Government sought to pursue a "neutralist" foreign policy while continuing a conventional military defence policy. Inevitably this meant that if confronted with international dangers the Indian Government would demonstrate in action the same faith in military defence as other countries.

If this was not to be, someone would have had to formulate at least the framework for a consciously adopted, carefully prepared, systematically trained programme for the nonviolent defence of India's newly gained freedom. No one did this.

In this situation it is significant that now Jayaprakash Narayan—who left politics to work in the nonviolent movement, although many expected him to be the next Prime Minister after Nehru—has come to a new awareness of the importance of this task.

In a speech in May 1963, Jayaprakash declared that he rejected both "meek submission to the Chinese injustice to us" and "compromise with cowardice". "There is no failure in a nonviolent war and we cannot forget all that Gandhi taught us. The alternative to violent war is total disarmament and nonviolent rearmament. If we actually demobilize the army, what would this mean? It would mean that we had shed all our fear of the Chinese, Russians and others and were determined not to bow our head before any aggressor; we will offer nonviolent resistance to them."

This was probably the first time such words had been heard from the lips of so prominent an Indian since that fateful afternoon of 30 January 1948. Obviously, however, the extraordinarily vast and difficult problems which are involved in the preparations for and execution of such an undertaking require the most serious programme of research and planning. There are not yet signs that this is being undertaken. The financial requirements of such a programme of investigation are large: £1,000,000 a year could be spent very usefully, given the right projects and personnel. Is the Indian Government likely to help? It is doubtful, although it is widely recognised that the present military programme is going to increase seriously India's economic problems, and hence may help indirectly to increase the strength of the Communists within India. Yet Nehru recognised the importance of further investigation of the nonviolent technique. He told Joan Bondurant: "I do not pretend to understand fully the significance of that technique of action, in which I myself took part. But I feel more and more convinced that it offers us some key to understanding and to the proper resolution of conflict." Gandhi's way showed achievement, Nehru said. "That surely should at least make us try to understand what this new way was and how far it is possible for us to shape our thoughts and actions in accordance with it."

However, the problem of tyranny and the problem of war are the problems not only of India, but of the whole world. Even if one thinks the chances of nonviolent action turning out to be an effective substitute for war are very small, the desperate nature of our situation is such that even such a small chance deserves full investigation.

This is the kind of tribute and remembrance which Gandhi would have appreciated. He was never one to claim he had all the answers or the final truth. He did not want people to be thinking always of him, but of the task which he had undertaken.

"I am fully aware that my mission cannot be fulfilled in India alone", Gandhi once wrote to an American correspondent. "I am pining for the assistance of the whole world. . . . But I know that we shall have to deserve it before it comes."

The quest for an alternative to war is now our common task in which Gandhi pioneered so significantly. Is it not now time that a full investigation into the potentialities of nonviolent action is both deserved and required?

VIOLENCE AND POWER POLITICS

Stephen King-Hall

Since the beginning of the story of the human race there have been a few Saints and many Sinners. Both Saints and Sinners recognized that differences of opinion have always existed between men and groups of men whether organized into tribes, nations or empires.

The Saints maintained that when their differences erupted into strife the correct reply to attack, to aggression, to injustice was peaceful resistance and indeed the exercise of love and charity to those who wished evil. Jesus Christ said it all in the Sermon on the Mount and the principles he expounded were implicit in Gandhi's teachings.

Nevertheless the Sinners continued to believe and practise the doctrine of the use of violence and on the short-term view it seemed as if logic was on their side. The British who conquered India did so using superior violence and William of Normandy practised the same technique when he conquered England in 1066.

In my life-time two great world wars have stained the pages of the history of mankind. In India countless thousands were slaughtered, when Moslems and Hindus separated after the departure of the British.

For thousands of years the use of violence has been the basis and ultimate sanction of power politics. Power politics when pursued to the ultimate was called war.

This habit of war is deeply ingrained in men's minds. Indeed it is impossible to imagine what history would have been like if (say) two thousand years ago, by some miracle, the logic and morality of pacifism had conquered men's minds.

War, i.e. the use of physical violence against an opponent, was taken for granted as being as much a part of the whole make-up of man as sex. A world without war was unimaginable. The small company of Saints who declared that, far from being unimaginable, to eschew violence was the course of wisdom were occasionally respected and tolerated (as was the case in Britain in World War II—but not in World War I) but usually persecuted as traitors.

It was taken for granted in the exercise of power politics between nations, that the greater the capacity, actual and potential for physical violence possessed by a nation, the higher its status in the table of precedence of Great Power. If you were able to unleash a great deal of violence you were a Great Power; with less violence capacity you were a Lesser Power.

The Saints and, indeed, the more intelligent Sinners were able to point out that very often these wars settled nothing, and that after a great expenditure of blood and treasure we were sometimes back where we started.

I recall that at Dartington Hall in Devonshire, somewhere about 1932, Rabindranath Tagore startled me by saying: "You British have no right to prevent India finding her soul if need be through a blood bath." I asked him what he thought the thousands of simple people would think about this, and whether they might not ask whether the search for the Indian soul could not proceed without the shedding of their blood.

□

It is common knowledge that great changes are often preceded by little indications whose significance is not recognized at the time. A few gusts of wind barely shaking the tree tops will presage a mighty storm; a laboratory experiment may be the start of an industrial revolution; an exchange of looks across a room between a man and a woman may be the beginning of a lifelong comradeship.

During the 1914-18 war one of these preliminary symptoms took place in the field of power politics. It was assumed throughout the war and written on parchment at Versailles in 1919 that the vanquished would pay the costs and preferably a bit more. It was discovered after years of endeavour that this was a fallacy. The defeated Germans could not be made to pay for the war even though they were lent vast sums of money to help them be good payers. This attempt to achieve what Sir Norman Angell in his book, *The Great Illusion* (1911), had declared would be impossible in "the next Great War" was a contributory cause to the great world slump of the 1930s, whose consequences in Germany did much to create conditions favourable to the rise to power of Hitler.

What had gone wrong?

It had become apparent by 1939 when the second Great War started that violence in power politics had become inconveniently large. This meant that in order to achieve one's political aims through military victory it was imperative to use so much violence that the enemy was ruined, flat on his back and unable to pay reparations. This painful discovery of the limitations of the use of violence in its modern forms *in the nuclear age* was taken into account in World War II.

I was a member of Parliament in that War, and I never recall anyone suggesting that after we had used violence to bring about unconditional surrender (a stupid war aim) and got rid of the Nazis, there was the slightest hope of the Germans paying for the war. Indeed it was generally recognized amongst those who could see further than the end of their noses that the victorious Allies would have to pour money and aid into a defeated Germany so as to avoid a slum in the middle of Europe.

I recall that Sir Winston Churchill questioned the desirability of continuing the heavy bombing of Germany in 1945 and made the common-sense remark: "Where are we going to live when we get there?" So it was established by the beginning of 1945 that military victory could only be obtained, at any rate in a considerable conflict, if a degree of violence was used which made it impossible for the defeated nation to pay reparations. On the contrary it had now become clear that part of the price of a military victory was the need for the victors to give economic help to the vanquished.

This had the unexpected and puzzling result that since the victors by using superior violence had destroyed all the capital equipment of the vanquished, the latter naturally and inevitably replaced what had been destroyed with new capital goods. Thus within a few years the defeated nation became a dangerously efficient competitor in world markets, because the victorious nation was still having to make do with old capital equipment.

For instance after World War I the Allies seized a lot of German merchant shipping, much of which was becoming old. Within a few years the German shipping lines were equipped with *new* ships largely paid for by aid from the Allies. It would have been more realistic to force the defeated Germans to keep their old ships, and forbid them to build new ones.

All this can be summed up by saying that, in the decades before the arrival of the nuclear weapon, the level of violence in war between Great Powers had reached so great and destructive a degree, that it was now only possible to use it to obtain a political objective (i.e. the overthrow of the Nazi Regime) and not both a political and economic purpose. Then in August 1945 came the atom bomb and soon after the H-bomb.

□

The degree of nuclear violence is so enormous and indeed virtually unimaginable, that the Saints and the Sinners are now on the same platform. Morality and expediency have become Siamese twins. "It is wicked to use violence", say the Saints. "It is mutual suicide to use it", say the Sinners. Some of the erstwhile Sinners, such as myself, therefore argue that since nuclear violence is logically unusable, and terribly expensive, it should be abandoned. We are in a minority because most people cannot break through the thought-barrier in this problem and bring themselves to believe that violence, certainly in nuclear form, has become useless.

The reason for this is that from the point of view of the Sinners, who would perhaps prefer to be called *the realists*, their world in which violence seemed to them to be useful, has been turned upside down too quickly. It has all happened within the life-span of one generation.

We have seen that between World Wars I and II the realists were obliged to admit that conventional violence had become so great, that it could no longer be sensibly used to achieve political *and* economic objectives.

But although half the apparent usefulness of violence had gone, the other half remained. It seemed that violence could still achieve political purposes and its supporters said: "It is true that great violence was used, but we did get rid of Hitler and the Nazis."

It is not relevant to their argument, so the realists would claim to say—as indeed I was saying in 1936/37—that one could have got rid of the Nazis by nonviolent methods if we had known how to use political warfare.

If there had been a third World War with conventional weapons and perhaps a 25 per cent increase of violence over World War II, then it might well have turned out that the educational process would have been completed. People might have said: "It is now clear that this idea of settling disputes by violence is obviously absurd. No one has won World War III."

But instead of mankind taking one more step towards the goal of realizing that violence had outlived its usefulness, it has made a leap into the nuclear age. We know, and our leaders keep on telling us, that nuclear war is mutual suicide but we still cannot swallow the fact that this is the end of the long connection between power politics and violence. The situation is still further confused by the fact that in non-nuclear situations, such as China's attack on India, violence can still appear to have a use.

What of the immediate future?

Clearly a very urgent and practical requirement is the prevention of the spread of nuclear weapons and, therefore, of violence capacity in its most deadly form. The hour is late and this objective will not be achieved unless the Americans and Russians can come to terms about this problem. It is also clear that the collaboration of the People's Republic of China would also be indispensable.

I do not believe that we can hope to get rid of the use of violence in non-nuclear form in power politics in one great and revolutionary world-wide act of renunciation. So the next step towards the disappearance of violence must be to concentrate its existence and control in the United Nations. It should be possible in the next ten years, to make some progress towards the establishment of a United Nations police force on a permanent basis. The Italians have a saying: "He who goes slowly goes safely; he who goes safely goes a long way."

Much as I would like to think otherwise it is only by adopting these principles that we can progress towards the ideal of the elimination of violence in international power politics.

INDIA YET MUST SHOW THE WAY

A.J. Muste

It seems to me that only a moderate amount of reflection is necessary to drive home the conclusion that opposition to (thoroughgoing non-cooperation with) war and the building of a nonviolent social base are inseparable. A violent society will wage war, it is true. It is also and equally true that a society which wages war will not develop a nonviolent social order. The relation here is not a chronological but a dialectical one. The issue of war and war-preparation cannot be postponed by India and especially the Gandhians in that country. The issue is as a matter of fact *there now.* The only logically and morally clear position for a Gandhian, it seems to me, is to say that at the least war must be eschewed and opposed by Gandhians. They must be under no illusion that waging a war, engaging in an arms build-up and arms race, promoting centralized control which this entails, psychologizing the people for waging war, cutting down on education and social services—all this on the one hand—and instilling nonviolence in the people and building a nonviolent social base can be treated as parts of a single spiritual, social and political whole. The ways in which opposition to or non-cooperation with the former may express itself if you are single-mindedly committed to nonviolence may vary greatly, as they do, for example, in the U.S. or the U.K. But, as Vinoba himself has suggested, violence in the nature of the case pushes nonviolence out and the one is in fact the ally or counterpart of the other.

It also follows, however, that the logical and morally clear position for the Gandhian is that the state or the nation and the people should also eschew war and be challenged to disarm, if necessary, unilaterally.

It is said, and correctly enough, that the nation is not ready. Its leaders chose from the beginning to equip it with armed forces. It has depended largely on armed force to back its stand on the Kashmir issue. Like every other nation, it prepares for war and trains its people for war. So how are they going to be prepared for nonviolence? And will India be any more prepared for nonviolence after it has gone through five or ten years of a military build-up to "contain" China? After an arms race? After more actual war on a larger scale perhaps?

Is it likely that any nation will go in *first* for a period of training in nonvolence and *then* in a war crisis defend itself nonviolently? Is it not likely that nonviolence will never be adopted unless some nation rises to the intellectual and moral height of making that decision precisely in a crisis when war threatens? Is it not in such circumstances that great decisions are usually made?

At the Anti-Nuclear-Arms Convention held in New Delhi in June 1962, the venerated first President of India, Dr Rajendra Prasad, in the opening address—what in the West is called a "keynote speech"—cited unilateral disarmament as the Gandhian position and specifically challenged India as well as other nations to adopt that policy as probably the only one that would bring about disarmament and peace. He must have known a good deal at that time of the relations with the Chinese which led up to the crisis that developed only four months later. He knew all about Kashmir certainly. With the President, Vice-President and Prime Minister sitting at the long table on the dais with him, he called on India to disarm unilaterally. It was widely reported in the press.

What happened when the crisis erupted? Virtually everybody, including, alas, Dr Prasad, forgot all about unilateral disarmament or brought up the argument on which all governments, Communist and Christian, the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. and China and India, in every continent agree. With one accord they testify: "It isn't practical, *especially not now*!" Most Gandhians and certainly a great many Western pacifists join the chorus. How does anyone think under such circumstances that unilateral disarmament or peace is ever going to come about?

This rejection or postponement of a unilateral initiative takes place at a time when the nuclear arms race has brought mankind to the brink of disaster and when every conflict threatens to become implicated in the global power-struggle and arms race; at a time when the thought of war should be abhorred and any kind of acquiescence in it or cooperation with it rejected, certainly by all who profess faith in nonviolence.

It happens, parenthetically, at a time when, to put it mildly, a very strong case can be made for the proposition that from a cold practical standpoint unilateral disarmament would be the best and safest course for India to take.

It seems agreed that China's military capability is ten times that of India. How long is it going to take India to close the gap? Vinoba some years ago made the sharp, witty comment about Indian armament: "We possess no bombs, so we think we should at least have a principle." If it goes in for an arms race, what will that do to the Indian economy? To its culture? Does the world need another demonstration of these things? A substantial military build-up cannot take place without U.S. aid. It is a question whether the U.S. wants to take on the commitments that an alliance would involve when it already has to dispose its forces at so many points throughout the world. If India, however, wants to rely on military means, it must ultimately depend on the U.S. nuclear shield. Is that what it wants? Even if it does, that shield may not be at its disposal.

Vinoba himself has pointed out the dilemma in which reliance on military force would involve India, in an essay recently published in an important book, *Democratic Values and the Practice of Citizenship*, based on an address he delivered several years ago. "If we decide for violence", he has said, "we shall have to take either Russia or America as our guru. . . . It would take us at least fifty years to get any strength from them," namely, become equal in strength, as the context indicates. "Is that what we want—that in the name of freedom, we should become either a slave or a threat to the peace of the world?" In view of such considerations, embarking on an arms race appears surely far more impractical and risky for India than unilateral disarmament might be.

As for the people not being ready for nonviolence, how do we know if they have no leadership and if the question is not even put to them? In the working session of the Anti-Nuclear-Arms Convention, when Dr Prasad's unilateral disarmament challenge was referred to, a representative of the Indian Communist Party in the meeting said if any Indian government proposed such a policy, the people would kick it out. I asked a distinguished Indian journalist afterwards whether he agreed. He replied, "Absolutely not. If a few men like Nehru, Prasad, Radhakrishnan, Husain, Rajagopalachari and J.P. Narayan got together and urged this course on the Indian people, they would meet a positive reponse from something deep in the souls of the people, as Gandhi did." Ever since the crisis, I have had informed Indians agree with that estimate. Granted that it is morally better to resist evil than not to resist or not to protect the helpless out of apathy or cowardice. But recklessness is not courage. Waging peace, practising nonviolence (or "nonviolent assistance", in one of Vinoba's happy phrases) also requires courage, and admittedly of a higher order. If men can be *quickly* trained to fight in an emergency, what could not be accomplished if leaders undertook to provide the same resources and the same inspiration for training in nonviolent action?

In one of these earlier addresses, Vinoba called attention to the psychology of military rivalry: "Russia says America has dangerous ideas, so she has to increase her armaments. America says exactly the same thing about Russia." The governments of India and Pakistan behave in the same way. Vinoba points out: "The image in the mirror is your own image; the sword in its hand is your own sword. And when we grasp our own sword in fear of what we see, the image in the mirror does the same. What we see in front of us is nothing but a reflection of ourselves. If India could find courage to reduce her army to the minimum, it would demonstrate to the world her moral strength." But he adds: "*We are cowards and cowards have no imagination*".

In these earlier addresses, Vinoba was extremely clear and even sharp on the point that "the Lord has so shaped the destiny of India that she must either commit herself wholeheartedly to the path of nonviolence or find herself enslaved to those who are adepts in violence". Once he said, "If you believe that it is right to use violent means to achieve good ends, you must recognize that Gandhiji's murderer also made a great sacrifice. I must tell you plainly that if we as a nation accept the idea that well-meaning people may use violence in order to put their ideas into practice, India will be broken into fragments and will lose all her strength. Violence may appear to solve one problem but another will appear in its place."

It seems to me extraordinarily interesting that Vinoba should have suggested, when he insisted that India must freely choose one way or the other and should choose Gandhi's way, that "it may be the Lord removed him from our midst for this very reason, so that it might no longer be the presence of his authority which would dictate the choice". In another address, he demanded that rather than not even live up to Gandhi's teaching and example, India should now go beyond them. He speaks of the sun as being pale in its dawning but becoming "dazzlingly brilliant" as the day progresses. "*Gandhi's times were the first pale dawn of the sun of satyagraha.*"

In the addresses which I am citing, Vinoba did not exclude the possibility and need of rapid and drastic change. On the contrary, he devoted an entire address to stressing the opposite. "People imagine", he says, "that ahimsa means that we should go to work as cautiously as a man who has a boil or some other injury on his hands and wants to avoid making it ache by any sudden exertion. Let there be no painful, sudden changes we say—*and so ahimsa is rendered innocuous*".

Such a conception of ahimsa, he continues, "appears to me to be very dangerous to the cause of nonviolence and very convenient for the cause of violence. . . . Therefore, it is not in the interest of nonviolence to equate ahimsa with an avoidance of trouble by reducing to the minimum the rate of social change. . . . So I beg of you not to adopt any go-slow methods in nonviolence.

Apply them to violence by all means—that is all to the good!" To apply go-slow methods to nonviolence is "to turn ahimsa into a conservative force, a preserver of the status quo. *The very conception of ahimsa is in danger.*"

Neither does Vinoba reject the idea that shanti-sainiks must on occasion oppose the government and expose its errors. And as for the charge that he will make people discontented with the status quo, with the result that "the present satisfactory"—in the eyes of the defenders of the status quo—"state of affairs will come to an end", the charge, namely, that he is a revolutionary, he retorts: " I accept this charge: I am certainly out to create discontent".

It is true that in these addresses he was dealing mainly with the need of social change, especially a peaceful revolution in land ownership, but at times, as we have seen, he was dealing also with the problem of government reliance on military force. In fact, it is precisely in a talk on "Unilateral Disarmament" that he insists on the necessity and possibility of rapid and drastic changes. He refers to the fact that Rajagopalachari, of all people, some years ago insisted that a government could not say to another: "If you act up to a certain level of good conduct, then we will do the same". A nation's "stock of goodness cannot be increased in that way. Goodness grows of itself." On this ground, Rajaji had suggested that the U.S. should disarm unilaterally.

Vinoba aptly comments: "But I wonder very much whether we are fit to give such advice to other countries. . . . How much support can he get from the country to which he belongs? Do we take the position that Pakistan is not our enemy no matter what she does? . . . *Things are getting so dark there that an ordinary lantern is not much use. Do we not need to put much more vigour into our nonviolence and give up our armed forces?*"

If we truly want peace, Vinoba continues, and believe in nonviolence, then we must disarm quickly. *"This task cannot wait. Our country must go ahead with nonviolence with the utmost speed."*

Can this happen when nonviolence makes headway so slowly? Can the ant overtake the eagle? "My answer is", Vinoba declares, "that it must happen, and it must happen now, for the time has come", because violence has run its course. He cites some of the well-known proofs of this and then asks: "How long is it possible for such stupidities in warfare to go on? Violence seems to be all-powerful at present, but in fact it is at the point of death." The bombs and the guns, he says, will be destroyed by the very workers who made them. The huge technical and political institutions can and will quickly be immobilized and destroyed: "What happens in an earthquake? The bigger the house, the sooner it falls."

Finally, Vinoba says, when will this change come about? His answer: "When our ways of thought are changed. When a revolution in thought takes place, a new world arises on the ruins of the old." In one of his simple illuminating figures by which he educates peasants and maybe also the wise of this world, he adds: "When the sun rises, the same people who a few hours previously spread out their sleeping mats, get up and roll them up. . . . So it follows that we have to work for the acceptance of new ideas—and that is exactly what I am doing."

It is indeed not only a breach of the "thought-barrier" that is needed, as Sir Stephen King-Hall, the British naval strategist, has also suggested. The world needs a revolution in feeling, in sensitivity, in orientation, in the spirit of man. This is an age in which the world of the physicist has become one of virtually infinite possibility. In every field of research the walls are down. In the realm of human relations, however, of politics in the basic sense, no such break-through has occurred. Here the walls press in upon man. The operative phrase is "the politically possible", which means what is possible within the existing socio-political context, the prevailing frame of thought. It would in fact be more accurate to say, "the outmoded, rapidly vanishing pre-nuclear-age context and frame of thought". As Einstein stated it definitively a decade and a half ago: "The splitting of the atom has changed everything save our modes of thinking, and thus we drift towards unparalleled catastrophe".

Obviously, no nation is in a position to pass on to another nation, no group or individual to pass on to another group or individual, the responsibility for achieving an intellectual and spiritual break-through. Least of all may anyone exonerate himself or his own people.

Having said this, I conclude by saying that I doubt if India, including the Gandhian movement, passed through their definitive crisis or whether they made their definitive decision in the autumn of 1962. The "moment of truth" is yet to come. Men and nations cannot freely choose, conjure up out of thin air, the moment when they reach the fork in the road. It comes, rather, as the ancient saying suggests, "as a thief in the night". I find myself still looking in humility and hope to India, even in trembling to its government and its Gandhians, to provide leadership in "the break-through to peace" instead of following in the footsteps of those who have not known Gandhi. Not having decided between violence and nonviolence is, as Vinoba once said, to be "in a terrible plight", and he added, "it is in that plight that we find ourselves today". In another talk, he stated in his characteristically penetrating fashion the challenge which the old associates and followers of Gandhi cannot escape: "Gandhi related every subject to the principle of nonviolence, so that we all carry the brand of nonviolence on our foreheads". He made it clear that he was speaking both of those who entered government and of those who remained outside. They, any more than the rest of us, can scarcely pass on their responsibility to somebody else.

WAR AND WHAT PRICE FREEDOM

William Stuart Nelson

In 1928 Mahatma Gandhi wrestled with the problem of war not simply as a theory but as an institution in which he had participated on three occasions as a noncombatant. He wrote: "I know that war is wrong, is an unmitigated evil. I know too that it has to go. *I firmly believe that freedom won through bloodshed or fraud is no freedom.*"[1]

This statement strikes many unfree men as a hard saying. Has not freedom, they ask, almost always been won by wars or some more subtle form of violence? Are we to believe that what was achieved at so great a price in reality was no freedom? Gandhi himself anticipated this scepticism and cited the French and Russian revolutions in defence of his thesis. Deeper hatred, counter-hatred, vengeance, he characterized sixteen years later, as the fruits of violence. War, for him, in summary, is an unmitigated evil. Indeed, freedom won by violence is no freedom.

Such convictions are politely attributed by some to the visionary. On the contrary, the current record attests to a different trend. Adlai Stevenson had once described war as containing the possibility of escalation into annihilation of all or most of mankind. Such an authority as the late General Douglas MacArthur spoke of ". . . the utter futility of modern war—its complete failure as an arbiter of international dissensions". To this may be added General Eisenhower's commentary on "the sterile, stupid business of war and preparation for war".

As late as June 1964, the President of Columbia University in New York City warned the more than six thousand graduates of that institution that ". . . we must restrain ourselves from the emotionally gratifying but socially dangerous tactics of violence to achieve our ends". Even though we no longer have with us India's late Prime Minister, Jawaharlal Nehru, the votaries of peace can find comfort and perhaps incentive to greater action in his testimony on the futility of hate and violence: "The lesson of history, the long course of history, and more especially the lesson of the last two great wars which have devastated humanity, has been that out of hatred and violence, only hatred and violence will come. We have got into a cycle of hatred and violence, and not the most brilliant debate will get you out of it, unless you look some other way and find some other means."

The psychiatrist himself is puzzled at what he calls the paradox of serving life while relying upon weapons of death. Dr Roy W. Menninger, a noted American psychiatrist, suggests that reliance upon weapons of final destructiveness will be abandoned only "when people discover that strength means other things than the capacity to destroy. In the lives of most of us, 'strength of character' is recognized as being stronger than the gun carried by the fearful insecure adolescent. By what means such concepts as 'strength of character' can be translated into national terms and then suffused into national behaviour is a question for which I have no answer. But it seems apparent that the failure to find a lasting belief in sources of strength other than weapons alone can lead only to the devastating outcome that all of us consider so possible."

Why do nations fight? Particularly, why do nations prepare to fight with weapons that are patently death-serving to all or nearly all who are involved, directly or indirectly? Eric Fromm, the eminent German psychologist and psychoanalyst, searching for an explanation of war, develops the thesis of the necrophilous person—a lover of death. But even Fromm, in suggesting such an unlikely hypothesis, makes this generalization: "Any glorification of violence is not only dangerous, it is based on untruth.

Dying is never sweet except for the necrophilous pervert, and killing never leads to the realization of what is human. Killing is always a violation of what is human, both in the killer and in the killed. It is condoned by many as being in the service of life, but it must always be atoned for because it always is a crime against life; it always hardens the heart of the killer, it always violates humanity."

The great dilemma which faces a morally sensitive nation today is, on the one hand, the sense of war's futility or, at least its dreadful cost, and, on the other, the fear of risking unilateral abandonment. The will to live is powerful and yet men would often rather die than bear the taunt of cowardice. What, then, is required to build an anti-war sentiment in a country? That the task is formidable is suggested by the confession of Gandhi that he was unprepared to chart the course to a warless society. His resourcefulness was consumed in fashioning an instrument for freeing Indians from colonialism and its multitude of miseries. He did, however, bequeath to us a principle tested on a limited stage. How may we now persuade men to test it on the international stage when the defence of "honour" is still an applauded ritual? Let us examine some possibilities.

The world recently took special notice of the fiftieth anniversary of the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand of Austria-Hungary and his wife. The word Sarajevo, city of that event, still excites a train of memories as tragic as any the world has ever known. There is the macabre succession of World War I, World War II, fascism, nazism, communism, Japanese militarism, the nuclear age. There is resurgent nationalism with nation-states seeking more and better armaments. Here we deal not with theory and speculation but with facts which have developed within the lives of millions now alive. As the race of man, we have no right to forget this procession of tragedy. We owe to the future the duty to keep it burning on the memories of mankind; perhaps that will give us pause and will forestall the fatal act.

We have, however, other persuasive grounds for looking elsewhere than to war for the solution of international problems. One of these is rooted in the nature of man, witnessed to persuasively by eminent thinkers in a wide diversity of fields.

On 3 July 1964 President Lyndon Johnson of the United States signed the bill passed by the Congress known as the Civil Rights Bill. In its widening of rights for Negroes as American citizens it is judged as second in importance only to Abraham Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation signed one hundred years ago. President Johnson closed his statement at the signing ceremony with the following resolve: "Let us hasten that day when our unmeasured strength and our unbounded spirit will be free to do the great works ordained for this Nation by the just and wise God who is the Father of all." Here we have the President of a nation for centuries deeply divided on racial lines evoking a spiritual law pronounced for millenia by prophets and seers and reiterated through the centuries by wise men without number, namely, the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. Millions of men today worship at the shrines of religions which teach the oneness of their Creator and the consequent brotherhood of the created.

The teaching of man's brotherhood has not remained, however, the exclusive province of the seer and prophet. The poet-clergyman, John Donne, brings his convictions down to earth and reminds us: "No man is an Island entire of itself; every man is a piece of the Continent, a part of the maine: any man's death diminishes me, because I am involved in mankind." The Greek author, Nikos Kazansakis, in his novel *The Greek Passion*, has one of his characters say: "Every man hangs around the neck of all of us."

Walter Lippman, leading essayist in political and moral philosophy, in his book *The Public Philosophy* has come to grips with the basic question of man's inherent relations to man. When, says Lippman, Jean Paul Sartre declares that God is dead, he is not simply giving up an anthropomorphic God but an *a priori* meaning to life. He is denying that beyond our private world there is a public world and declaring that what is good and right and true is what each of us chooses to invent. This view takes us "outside the traditions of civility. We are back in the war of all men against all men. There is left no accommodation among the variety of men, nor is there in this proclamation of anarchy a will to find an accommodation." Bertrand Russell, Lippman points out, has recognized that this way leaves us without a check on pride and puts us on the road to an intoxication of power and to the danger "of vast social disaster".

Even Voltaire, to whom we cannot impute starry-eyed gazing or sentimentalism, defines in terms of signal horror an act of fatal violence against one's fellowman. He writes: "Twenty years are required to bring a man from the state of a plant in which he exists in the womb of his mother and from the state of an animal, which is his condition in infancy, to a state in which the maturity of wisdom begins to make itself felt. Thirty centuries are necessary in which to discover even a little of his structure. An eternity would be required to know anything of his soul. But one moment suffices to kill him."

Joining this eminent chorus, Sigmund Freud obeserves: "All that produces ties of sentiment between man and man must serve as war's antidote. . . . The psychologist need feel no compunction in mentioning 'love' in this connection. The other bond of sentiment is by way of identification. All that brings out the significant resemblances between men calls into play this feeling of community, identification, whereon is founded, in large measure, the whole edifice of human society."

Each of us on the basis of each day's experience can testify to man's commonality. We all know that mankind is supported by one universe—the same earth feeds us, the same sun warms us, and the same stars shine upon us all. There is a common quality in our basic emotions. Not only one joy but one sorrow unites us. The emotions of the mother in Calcutta at the death of her child differ little or not at all from the emotions of the mother in New York or Sydney or Moscow at the loss of her child. In the presence of birth and death, sickness and health, youth and old age, triumphs and defeats, we experience feelings that differ in no fundamental way. We meet these events with joy and sorrow, courage and cowardice, love and hatred. We walk the path from birth to death with basically the same desires—happiness, self-realization, social fulfilment. Certainly, from nation to nation, race to race, family to family, individual to individual our experiences come in sundry forms, our emotions are expressed differently, we seek fulfilment in a variety of ways; but the basic quality of our emotions and the basic direction of our natures are the same. We are one people.

It may appear strange and yet it is true that all this in man's history—fear of death, the voices of prophets, poets and philosophers, the assurances of scientists—has not sufficed to prevent the tragedy of slaughter through war. We have been warned, however, by the American philosopher, William James, that men will not be persuaded easily to abandon war, that war against war is no holiday excursion or camping party.

James saw no hope of avoiding war except by inventing its moral equivalent. He would have the government conscript youth to wage a war against nature. These youths would work in coal mines, on fishing fleets in winter, on the frames of the tallest buildings, all according to their choice. "Such a conscription", he wrote, "with the state of public opinion that would have required it, and the many moral fruits it would bear, would preserve in the midst of a pacific civilization the manly virtues which the military party is so afraid of seeing disappear in peace".

No nation, I believe, has followed James's prescription but the title of his essay, "The Moral Equivalent of War", remains to haunt us. We, in our time, must discover that equivalent. The first step is to create a national character which is antithetical to war and the qualities which breed war. This suggests not simply a struggle with nature, as James proposed, but a struggle with the anti-social manifestations of human nature.

The purpose around which a struggle can be mounted is that of making one's own nation a nation of justice in which mutual confidence and concern dominate, rather than suspicion and hate. This means a land, for example, where politics is a spring of well-being rather than a stage on which a struggle for power and power alone is waged; where commerce exists to serve the whole people rather than to create profits for the few; where religious institutions are the bearers of truth rather than the seats of theological and organizational divisiveness.

Gandhi laid great store by his constructive program. For him it was not an embellishment but an essential to the struggle for freedom. He saw freedom from colonialism as an illusion without the character, the national solidarity inherent in a spirit and program of mutual helpfulness among the people. " . . . we can never reach Swaraj", he said, "with the poison of untouchability corroding the Hindu part of the national body". Freedom under such a circumstance he called a meaningless term. It would appear clear that only the discipline productive of internal harmony can bring a people to oppose an external enemy nonviolently—discipline which has withstood abuse, alienation, perhaps even death, but also discipline which has turned hatred into fraternity, combativeness into cooperation, suspicion into mutual confidence.

Facing the difficulties of bringing a people to the mood necessary for unilateral disarmament, the devotees of nonviolence must understand the problems of the political establishment which seeks by slow and even halting steps, political in nature, to lay the foundation of peace with another nation or nations: a treaty here, partial disarmament there; cooperation in some international understanding; building bridges of understanding between even small segments of their country with another. Politicians are not miracle workers; they are heads of states, not saints. They do not operate from ashrams. They are leaders but also they are subject to the dictates of the people. Devotees of a nonviolent worldbe ar, in relation to them, three responsibilities: themselves to be unfailing examples of nonviolence; to stand in judgment upon such leaders of the state but not in pious, intolerant judgment and to press the nonviolent ideal upon them with clarity and vigorous insistence; by example and preachment to win so large a segment of the populace to this conviction that the leaders need no longer fear to take the nonviolent step but will fear not to take it.

During the process of national spiritual discipline unilateral disarmament may appear plausible. So wise a man as the late President of India, Dr Rajendra Prasad, has proposed that in such a case the world would not permit a country so venturing to fall a victim to aggression. This would be a risk, but in its favour is the effort to establish a moral principle of incalculable dimensions—performance, as Gandhi called it, of "a perfect act" enshrining "an eternal law". It would have in its favour the fact also that if a country were overrun this would not be necessarily at the cost of national suicide. Since time immemorial conquered peoples have borne their misfortune bravely and once again have flowered. What they failed to achieve by force of arms they have accomplished in relation to their conquerors by moral and cultural dominance.

War is too great a price even for freedom. The freedom which it appears to win is illusory. On the contrary the offering of life on the moral altar by the individual or the nation is redemptive. It is the act called by Gandhi "a perfect act" enshrining "an eternal law".

---

1. Italics are this author's.

A COORDINATED APPROACH TO DISARMAMENT

Charles C. Walker

The necessity for universal disarmament is generally recognized. How to achieve it has been the subject of prolonged and frustrating debate. The tendency has been for discussions to polarize into contrasting positions: negotiation vs. unilateral action; all at once vs. step by step; security first vs. disarmament first.

It is not surprising that deep-seated differences should have arisen. Disarmament means the liquidation of the war system. This is a formidable task, no less a task than replacing a system which has functioned for six thousand years. The emergence of a new international system in which war has been eradicated and a stable peace effected will be one of the great landmarks in human history. Inevitably it will bring in its wake far-reaching changes in human attitudes, behaviour and institutions. A task of this size and complexity cannot be accomplished without the dedicated labour of many people working at various facets of the problem.

The time has come when it is both necessary and possible to coordinate several approaches to working for disarmament, and to develop a comprehensive strategy of action. I would suggest five major fronts.

1. Universal Disarmament: This is the objective towards which all disarmament advocates press, by whatever route it ultimately comes. For example, unilateralists would not be content if their nation alone disarmed, faced indefinitely with an armed and threatening world. Nothing less than the abolition of the war system itself can pave the way for the emergence of a durable peace.

When USSR Chairman Khrushchov and British Foreign Secretary Selwyn Lloyd made speeches at the United Nations in 1959, calling for general and complete disarmament, the peace groups in the US, whatever the approach of their particular organizations, united in trying to persuade the US Government to declare general and complete disarmament to be an avowed objective of US foreign policy. There were powerful forces in the Kennedy administration that viewed disarmament as nothing more than wishful thinking, or even dangerous nonsense. Over these objections, President Kennedy made such a declaration in a speech at the UN.

Those who have emphasized universal disarmament have usually relied almost exclusively upon negotiation as the instrument for achieving it. The record of these negotiations is a discouraging story. They have usually been a part of the power struggle rather than an alternative to it, as each side has tried to put the other on the spot and make itself appear to be the "peace-loving nation". There is much truth in the statement that negotiations do not change fundamentals, they register "situations of fact" (a phrase of Dean Acheson's).

Within the past few years, it appears that among experts in the nuclear powers there is a new willingness to look seriously at the possibility of universal disarmament. The present international system is clearly becoming unmanageable. Even such tentative steps as tacit agreements to limit the arms race (e.g. not to take civil defence very seriously), attempts to prevent accidental war, various forms of arms control, etc., may be the first signs of a new direction. For some, they may be adjustments to try to save the system—to make the world safe for World War II—but on the other hand they may initiate a trend that could gather momentum and inaugurate a fundamental system change.

However, negotiation alone, and the advice of experts, are not enough to counteract the fantastic momentum of military technology, as well as the persistence of old ways of thinking and acting. Other approaches are required which may help to produce a situation where negotiations can be more fruitful.

2. *Demilitarization*: This means the actual achievement of disarmament in a geographical area. It should not be confused with "demobilization" or any other measure short of the liquidation of military forces in a specific area.

Demilitarization can be accomplished by force, agreement or by unilateral action. At the end of World War II, Germany and Japan were forcibly disarmed by the Allied Powers. Some proposals for disengagement have envisaged demilitarized zones in Central Europe. Frequently, a crisis situation will lead to proposals for demilitarization of the critical area, e.g. Berlin.

US military expert Walter Millis has pointed out that no South American nation is today in a position to wage a successful war against a neighbour. Since the Chaco wars earlier in the century, the possibility of war on that continent has receded. The national military forces are for internal use. This situation might be carried a step further: abolish the armies and make all of South America a demilitarized zone. However, this would have revolutionary implications for the internal structure of the nations and societies. If a nonviolent revolutionary movement took root in South America, one of its political objectives could be the demilitarization of the entire continent.

An area from which military forces have been withdrawn will find it difficult to remain so in the absence of a movement towards universal disarmament. Much depends upon the dynamics of the larger situation of which the area is a part. Demilitarization can be a means for limiting a danger that could become explosive; such situations are likely to be transitory. To be significant for the cause of disarmament, demilitarization would take place in a context where nations are genuinely moving towards general and complete disarmament.

3. *Unarmed Areas*: If demilitarization refers to removal of military forces, the term "unarmed areas" is used for those areas, even nations, where arms are not introduced in the first place. For example, the continent of Antarctica has been declared an unarmed area, by way of a treaty signed by fourteen nations,

including the US and the USSR. There have been proposals advanced in the United Nations to the effect that no nation should use outer space for military purposes.

Some of the new nations in Africa have not fully decided whether to build a conventional military establishment; Tanganyika, for example. It is not inconceivable that several nations in East Africa might experiment with this course of action: Zambia (Northern Rhodesia) under the leadership of Kenneth Kaunda, Mozambique, Tanganyika, possibly Kenya. The likelihood would be greater if a joint approach could be worked out among these nations in East Africa.

The very existence of an unarmed state refutes the conventional theory that the nature of the state requires military power. Regional groupings of unarmed nations would be of even more significance, and would provide a valuable opportunity to study the dynamics of a situation that may foreshadow the demilitarization of the African continent. So far this is a slender hope but it cannot be ruled out.

4. *Unilateral Disarmament*: Costa Rica, in Central America, is the only nation unilaterally disarmed today. By its 1959 constitution it is not permitted to have a standing army. The reasons for this action are not pacifist ones, and no provisions for nonviolent resistance have been made. Costa Rica relies upon the Organization of American States for protection. When Nicaragua invaded, the OAS gave stern orders to withdraw, and Nicaragua did. But again, the fact that a nation has taken this action disproves the contention that it can't be done.

The British Labour Party for a short time was on record for unilateral nuclear disarmament of Great Britain. Hugh Gaitskell successfully led the fight to rescind that position. In any case, it seems to me, nuclear disarmament is a half-way house in which one cannot live for long. Complete unilateral disarmament would be a more realistic as well as more creative course. Leading non-pacifists in Britain have said already that within a decade, given present trends, this may be the most realistic policy for Britain to take.

A demilitarized Germany does not seem to be a step which the US and USSR are prepared to negotiate; possibly the time for that has passed. This leaves the German people three broad choices: (a) a divided Germany as now, indefinitely; (b) united and armed by unilateral action of the German people; or (c) united and unarmed by similar unilateral action. Only the third is a choice with hope. It may be a long time away, but so is any resolution of the German problem, it would appear.

India may one day decide to embark upon unilateral disarmament as the only viable alternative to a protracted and ultimately disastrous arms race with China, and deeper involvement in the Cold War. Japan may be faced with a similar choice.

There could be a transitory moment when the US or the USSR would strike out on a sudden and radical course of unilateral disarmament. That moment would be the time of a large-scale accidental war. The world would be so terror-stricken, with the danger of all-out war so imminent, that a "crash program for disarmament" might be inaugurated by a nation with the sense and initiative to do so. Leading military experts in the US have urged that plans be drawn up for this eventuality.

New books appearing on the subject of disarmament almost invariably have a chapter or article on unilateral disarmament—something very unlikely only a few years ago. It would be ironic if non-pacifists began to take unilateral disarmament seriously when many pacifists have dismissed it out of an all too soft and unrealistic "realism". A mass movement for unilateral action would impart impetus to all other efforts for disarmament, all the more so if such movements could develop an international strategy.

5. *Unilateral Initiatives*: This term describes an action that a nation may take, depending neither upon threat nor negotiation, which is itself a step in the direction of disarmament. (Technically, unilateral disarmament is an extreme unilateral initiative.) Examples of initiatives a nation might take are those ending nuclear tests, whether other nations do so or not; ending research and stockpiling of biological or chemical weapons; pledging only non-military uses of outer space; ending conscription; withdrawing from military bases.

A series of such steps, taken with special care as to timing and sequence, could help break through the vicious circle of fear and distrust that surrounds the arms race.

It is possible that a nation could take a number of such steps without impairing its relative power position. Thus the significance and effectiveness of unilateral initiatives will depend upon the motivation and context of such actions. If they are steps taken only to limit the extreme dangers of the arms race, or to gain a temporary propaganda advantage, they will be only ripples in a current. If they are, on the other hand, firm and scheduled steps by way of implementing a decision to procced to general and complete disarmament, then the strategy of unilateral initiatives can be of great value. It is the political platform on which a number of disarmament and more broadly based peace groups can unite for common organizational efforts. It is the basis for Turn Towards Peace in the US, and is likely to be the basis for action in an international confederation.

This analysis has been confined to disarmament alone. It has not proposed to deal with priorities, time tables, alternative international systems, economic or political consequences, etc. All of these have their place but it is the steady drive to universal disarmament that gives order and drive to the whole effort. What conclusions can be drawn?

1. Success on any one of the five fronts is likely to have an impact on the total task. A gain on one front will be a gain on all.

2. There will come a time and place to emphasize one approach over others. When a favourable moment for negotiation appears, press for an agreement. When a specific issue, e.g. nuclear testing appears as a focus of concern and action, press for a unilateral initiative. When the situation is tense, with little chance for negotiation or initiatives, press the total case for the failure of military security and the inescapable necessity for ending the war system.

3. Peace groups must look beyond their own borders in order to see the dimensions of the total task. As the military aspect of the situation has become trans-national, so must the efforts to secure disarmament. The incipient trend towards internationalizing the peace movement can be of assistance in this task. Even now, without a large scale international organization a much

greater degree of coordination is possible.

A parallel from the anti-colonial struggle may be instructive. There were many factors that undermined the theory and practice of colonialism. Three major factors may be singled out; (a) the organization of national resistance movements which forced the pace and made ultimate victory certain; (b) the unfolding logic of the colonial process and structure often driven home by friends of anti-colonialism within the system itself; (c) the impact of large-scale related events, such as the two World Wars.

To draw the parallel with the struggle for peace, first of all, mass movements for war resistance and disarmament, cooperating across national lines, are essential. Without these, other developments can too readily be thwarted and corrupted. Within this context, as war becomes ever more irrational and unworkable and this is realized by military experts themselves, they may be able to function within the councils of state in a way that gives substantial impetus to the drive for disarmament. There will also, no doubt, be great moments of decision, appearing suddenly and unpredictably, where the course of history can be changed and new epochs opened up for the human race. Thus, we should work away guided by our best lights, working with conviction but not dogmatism, with dedication but not intolerance.

Whether progress towards disarmament comes haltingly or rapidly, it will come through the vision and labours of unnumbered people who have performed that task it was within their power to do. However, it is this generation of all others which has the historic task of bringing these efforts to fruition.

A DISARMAMENT ADEQUATE TO OUR TIMES

T.K. Mahadevan

> Diseases desperate grown
> By desperate appliance are relieved,
> Or not at all.
>
> *Hamlet*

> Against a great evil, a small remedy does not produce a small result; it produces no result at all.
>
> John Stuart Mill

The supreme tragedy of our time is that we are trying to fit old, habitual solutions to a problem of epic proportions, the like of which man had not faced since he first took to a gregarious life on earth. We have lost, or perhaps never achieved, the capacity for epic thinking. We seem unable to accustom ourselves to the bizarre challenges that face us. The revolutions in science have given us the power of quick and disastrous invention but not the power of dauntless thinking. Our machines increasingly resemble men and imitate their subtle ways—but alas, how near we ourselves are to the condition of a robot, tottering along set grooves of thought and action, afraid to venture out into new and unknown ways, and pathetically suspicious of anything that might upset our accustomed ways and valuations.

Disarmament is not a new problem. In the sense of a penal destruction or reduction of the armament of a defeated country, disarmament is perhaps as old as war itself. In the sense of a reduction and limitation of national armament by general international agreement—what now mostly goes by the vogue-word of Arms Control—it was first discussed in The Hague Conference of 1899 and is thus virtually a product of the twentieth century. In the more comprehensive sense of an abolition of all armament—the only sense that can have any meaning to us in the thermonuclear age—disarmament came into the arena of international discussion only after the Great War and the founding of the League of Nations, and even then only in a lackadaisical, half-hearted way. It took Hitler, the World War and Hiroshima for nations to think of disarmament seriously.

But the disarmament issue that faces us today is of an entirely different complexion and magnitude. We have no longer the luxury of time at our disposal to weigh the pros and cons and to go into the political niceties of the available traditional approaches to disarmament. Failure to achieve a quick solution can have only one relentless result—disaster. The extraordinary urgency of our present situation is not one that could be argued about. Men who ought to know have told us in unmistakable terms what the consequences of our folly could be. Herman Kahn has categorically asserted that "one must eventually introduce a *major change* in the situation or expect to get into a war anyway". For, as he rightly argues, "it is most unlikely that the world can live with an uncontrolled arms race lasting for several decades". A recent report of the National Planning Association of America has this alarming conclusion: "Not only does the danger of war remain a possibility, but the probability totalled over time increases, becoming a certainty if sufficient time elapses without succeeding in *finding alternatives*."

What *major change* have we introduced into the present situation of bewilderment and drift? What *alternatives* have we found? None whatsoever. We are victims of our own cliches. We are a race of bewildered, impotent men trying to fit disarmament, in its nuclear overtones, into our frozen, pre-nuclear stereotypes and being rather dismayed at the result. For though it looks like an old problem, disarmament as we know it today is, in fact, a stark new problem and it can only be solved in a stark new way. Our crisis is thus essentially psychological, a crisis of failure to break away from habits of thought which have no relevance to the problems of our time. To ascribe it to the rapid advances in weapons technology or the misuse of scientific knowledge is to misunderstand the true implications of our problem.

We are living in fantastic times—let us face this fact—and only an act or acts of fantastic courage and daring can deflect us from the path of certain disaster. This is no time for lukewarm attitudes or a gradualist, empirical approach. Nor for leisurely feeling our way, one little step at a time. This is the time for a bold, reckless leap—even a leap into the unknown. This is the time for a revolution in our thinking—for an agonizing reappraisal of our basic concepts of peace and human brotherhood. This, in short, is the time for a new realism in international relations.

I believe that this realism is most in evidence in Gandhi's hitherto unheeded call for unilateral disarmament. In our current phantasmagoria of the megaton bomb, the Polaris missile and mega-death, the only step that makes any coherent sense is for each nation, big or small, nuclear or non-nuclear, to take the lone decision of scrapping its own armoury all on its own without waiting for others to make a start. A negotiated disarmament is a political fiction. We shall await till doomsday—and how near doomsday is!—if we hope that agreement will be reached on all the minutiae that have kept disarmament negotiations going endlessly for the best part of two generations.

Even a cursory study of the history of disarmament will reveal that every so-called disarmament proposal is a veiled move in the game of international hide-and-seek, an essential factor in the strategy of power. It would be the height of naivete to imagine that the ever-new disarmament proposals that often catch the headlines have been motivated by a genuine desire for peace. On the contarary, every one of them can be shown to be a sinister move to gain a strategic advantage over one's opponent. This being the case, it will be unpardonable folly to expect anything to come out of the present merry-go-round of disarmament talks. Multilateral disarmament is a contradiction in terms. Someone must lay down arms *first*. Disarmament will never get a start except unilaterally. It must *begin* with some one nation, big or small. There is no other way.

The general objection against unilateral disarmament is that it is quixotic, unrealistic, utopian. Maybe it is all these. But are we not living in a very *quixotic* age? What is *realistic* about the nightmare world that is unravelled, say, in the yearly proceedings of the Pugwash Conference? And why should any man be apologetic about being *utopian* when the only alternative to a Utopia is the extinction of man?

But, fortunately, unilateral disarmament is neither quixotic nor utopian. In fact, if there are any lessons to be learnt from the woeful history of disarmament, the unilateral approach is the only probable and *realistic* way to achieve disarmament in our time. For consider the conflict between national security and disarmament. Every government gives first precedence to its own security and will in no case agree to any change in the existing armament balance unless it is satisfied that such change will not endanger its security. Add to this the axiom that one nation's security is another's insecurity, and we at once see what a hopeless mess we would land ourselves in if we believed in the myth of negotiated, multilateral disarmament. The security demands of even two nations are hard to reconcile, not to speak of the security needs, whether real or imagined, of the five score nations which sit around the United Nations table.

No, we cannot have national security and international disarmament at one and the same time. One will eventually have to be sacrificed to the other—and which shall that one be? The answer is clear. Unless we are either insane or inhuman, or both, there is no doubt we shall all opt for the saving of humanity and human civilization rather than the illusory pursuit of our own, private, national safety.

In the final analysis, the case for unilateral disarmament stands or falls by how we answer two simple questions: (a) Is there any known method, other than a unilateral act of courage and sacrifice, by which the besetting fear of one nation for another can be rooted out? (b) Even if unilateral disarmament were to fail, will the failure be as catastrophic to humanity as the continuance of the arms race which is implicit in the never-ending process of negotiated disarmament?

We can improve upon many things that Gandhi taught us — his religion and philosophy, even his economics and politics—but we cannot improve upon this central theme-song of his whole life, this concept of daring, unilateral action —satyagraha—which finds its culmination in his call for unilateral disarmament. Many of us swear by satyagraha and some of its more fashionable modern variants, little realizing that unilateral disarmament—the phrase we shun like the plague—is nothing other than satyagraha in its international dimension. We are universal in our condemnation of armaments but we are blind to the logical corollary of our condemnation—that if we are genuine in our belief that all arms are evil the honest thing for us to do is to strip ourselves of the evil at once, regardless of whether others do likewise.

SECTION FOUR

THE IMPACT OF GANDHI ON THE U.S. PEACE MOVEMENT

Charles C. Walker

Gandhi's influence on the peace movement in the United States was felt as early as the 1920s. An early and effective exponent of Gandhi's ideas here was John Haynes Holmes, a prominent Unitarian minister and reformer, and an outspoken pacifist in World War I. He first set forth his discovery of Gandhi in a sermon titled "The Christ of Today" which was widely circulated. In another sermon in 1922 called "Who is the Greatest Man in the World Today?" his designation of Gandhi amazed many listeners, most of whom had never heard the name before. Gandhi's autobiography was first published in America in the magazine *Unity* of which Holmes was the editor.

There were landmark books: by Romain Rolland in 1924, and three by C.F. Andrews published here in 1930 and 1931. *The Power of Nonviolence* by Richard B. Gregg first appeared in 1934 (two revised editions have subsequently been published). Probably no other book on nonviolence has been so widely read by U.S. pacifists, or used as a basis of a study program.

Krishnalal Shridharani's *War without Violence* was a valuable exposition of the methods of nonviolent direct action. He was sharply critical of Western bourgeois pacifism, and emphasized that satyagraha was as much a method of struggle as of persuasion.

A popular lecturer in America was Muriel Lester, an English friend of Gandhi with whom he stayed at Kingsley Hall when he attended the Round Table Conference in London. In the early 1930s, she began a series of lecture tours in the U.S., speaking widely to groups outside the traditional peace ranks, and gave vivid accounts of Gandhi's nonviolent undertakings. C.F. Andrews also came on a nation-wide lecture tour.

The movement for Indian independence found many sympathisers and supporters, outside as well as inside the peace movement. Accounts of nonviolent resistance in the 1930-33 all-India campaign were reported in the U.S. newspapers by such journalists as Negley Farson and Webb Miller. Liberals and progressives of various kinds were heartened by successful struggles against colonialism and imperialism. The Salt March was for many young idealists an inspirational example of principled action. John Gunther's *Inside Asia,* widely read in America, gave sympathetic portraits of Gandhi and Nehru, and heightened interest in the Indian independence movement.

Between world wars, liberal religion with a strong social action emphasis became a significant force in American life. Pacific methods were regarded as ethically more appropriate instruments than violence for the attainment of social and political objectives. Gandhian nonviolence was congenial to such a mood of thought and action—or at least thought to be. Religious leaders who were also social idealists were attracted by Gandhi's efforts to aply religious insights to social and political problems. They were impressed by his battle against caste and untouchability. While John Haynes Holmes remained the leading popularizer of Gandhi's ideas here, there were also E. Stanley Jones, a Methodist missionary deeply influenced by his experience in India; and Kirby Page, a key figure in the peace movement for many years.

Quakers were drawn to Gandhi because of their mutual interest in the practical effect of religious experience, as well as principled rejection of violence. Rufus Jones, noted philosopher and leader in Quaker affairs, was deeply impressed by the spiritual force of Gandhi's personality (in an interview in 1926), and in later years referred to him as "the greatest person now living on our planet". This was in spite of differences with Gandhi over interpretation and expression of the mystical element in religion.

Prominent Negro ministers who were also involved in the peace movement, such as Benjamin Mays and Howard Thurman, had interviews with Gandhi and it was to the latter that Gandhi commented, "It may be through the Negroes that the unadulterated message of nonviolence will be delivered to the world".

A highly influential sector of the peace movement in the 1930s had a generally socialist orientation. The country was passing through the serious crisis of the Depression, and the menacing figure of Hitler loomed on the horizon. This leadership element was impressed by the anti-imperialist and anti-colonial aspect of the Indian independence movement and, it must be said, there were those who were always pleased to see the Indians (or anyone) twisting the British lion's tail. On the other hand, they were either baffled by or critical of Gandhi's economic views, as they understood them, and there were Marxist elements, both Socialist and Communist, who were hostile to Gandhi's influence.

Reinhold Niebuhr, an influential figure in religious circles and in movements for social justice, argued that Gandhi's satyagraha was a form of social and political coercion, and not the pure example of social idealism to the extent believed either by Gandhi himself or by his American exponents. Niebuhr was a formidable critic of religious liberalism. While he believed that there is a religious sanction for coercive methods in the political and economic world, he held that a principled nonviolent actionist could be a witness to a more excellent way as a special religious vocation, so long as nonviolence was not advanced as a political strategy required by the ethic of Christian love.

Nevertheless, as far back as 1932 Niebuhr urged American Negroes to adopt satyagraha in the struggle for racial justice. In the magazine *The World Tomorrow* (1934) Cranston Clayton argued that Gandhian methods were especially appropriate to the American scene and were necessary as a stage beyond the traditional methods of persuasion and education. It was not until two decades later that this idea began to flower in the civil rights movement.

In the field of labour, there were those such as A.J. Muste and others who evolved methods of nonviolent action although their inspiration came more from European radicals than from Gandhi. Some labour historians assert that violence has been a prominent feature in the history of the U.S. labour movement. However the Lawrence Textile Strike of 1919, a landmark in U.S. labour history, was won primarily because of the determination of the workers to remain nonviolent in face of severe provocation and violence by factory owners and police.

There were middle-class elements in the peace movement who were highly critical of strikes and overt economic struggle, believing them to be "unreconciling" or even inconsistent with religious ethics. Similar arguments were carried on here as Gandhi faced opposition in his efforts to end domestic injustices in India.

While Gandhi had little noticeable impact on the development of the labour movement in America. some of the experiences in it were to prove significant as background for the later emergence of nonviolent direct action as a method of social change.

The seminal stage for the emergence of the "radical caucus" in the peace movement was the decade of the 1940s, during and after World War II. This group was increasingly preoccupied with Gandhian ideas *in action*, with the conscious application of satyagraha as an organizational mode of action on the American scene.

The Second World War was a severe challenge to the U.S. peace movement. While its major task during that period was survival, it also directed attention to proposals regarding postwar settlements and the conditions of peace. In this connection, there were debates about the kind of movement that could be relevant and effective in the turbulent postwar period.

One wing of the movement was radical in orientation and ethos. It represented a curious amalgam of traditions including revolutionary Marxism, anarchism, Protestant activism, Quakerism, American pragmatism—and Gandhian nonviolence.

One might arbitrarily set as a symbol of the new period the publication in 1940 of A.J. Muste's book *Nonviolence in an Aggressive World*. Muste directed his argument to three major groups: those in the Judaeo-Christian tradition, those in movements for basic social justice, and advocates of democracy. He insisted that nonviolence was an essential ingredient of all three, and that to depart from a nonviolent base was to introduce a deeply disorienting and corrupting factor. Two chapters on "Pacifism as Revolutionary Strategy" foreshadowed much that was to appear later as significant ideological tendencies in the movement.

Jay Holmes Smith and Ralph Templin, two missionaries in India who were expelled for their sympathies with the Gandhian movement, formed an *ad hoc* committee on nonviolent direct action, centred in New York City. The actions and teachings of this group directly influenced A. Philip Randolph, a Negro labour leader, and some of the founders of the Congress of Racial Equality. It was Randolph who threatend a large scale march of Negroes on Washington, in 1941, in protest against discriminatory racial practices in industry. To forestall this march, President Franklin Roosevelt signed an executive order establishing a Fair Employment Practices Commission.

However, it was in the staff of the Fellowship of Reconciliation, a religious pacifist group under the leadership of Muste who became executive secretary in 1940, that decisions were made which set the future course of nonviolent action in the United States. There it was decided to apply the strategy and tactics of nonviolent direct action to the field of racial justice. This decision was based on two major considerations: the growing moral consensus on racial justice, and a steadily increasing number of laws against the practice of racial discrimination.

It soon became clear that the FOR could not carry on this task alone. There were few Negroes who would take such a radical position, and some of them had little interest in a religious organisation. Furthermore, there was a very small minority of religious pacifists who were constrained to involve themselves in this kind of activity. A new organization was formed in 1942 called the Committee of Racial Equality (Committee was later changed to Congress) with a strategic commitment to nonviolent methods and discipline. In the combined work of CORE and the FOR, figures emerged such as Bayard Rustin, James Farmer, and George Houser. Action projects and workshops were devised not only to secure change in the field of race relations but, equally important, to educate for the broader application of nonviolence. It was in this undertaking that much was learned about fundamental strategic and tactical considerations, as well as the corporate discipline, appropriate to the American scene. These factors were later to become important as background resources for the emerging civil rights movement in the middle 1950s.

Speakers and writers were also preparing the soil. Pacifist groups, in particular the American Friends Service Committee, scheduled Indian speakrs who recounted Gandhian campaigns and described the Gandhian approach: Amiya Chakravarty, Eddy Asirvatham, Haridas Muzumdar, J.B. Kripalani, Nirmal Kumar Bose, Bharatan Kumarappa, K.K. Chandy, Richard Keithahn, and Sushila Nayyar. (More recently there were A.K. Mitra, Gurdial Mallik and, most recently, Marjorie Sykes.)

Significant writers had been deeply influenced by Gandhi, and their writings had an impact far beyond the peace movement. There were Louis Fischer, Vincent Sheean, Pearl Buck, Aldous Huxley, Herrymon Maurer, John and Frances Gunther, Edmond Taylor, Chester Bowles.

The advent of peacetime conscription in 1948 was another important event for the American peace movement. There was no organization able to spearhead civil disobedience against conscription. A new group was formed called Peacemakers. While draft resistance was the immediate catalyst, the founders of Peacemakers hoped to inaugurate a new phase of disciplined and revolutionary activity in the peace movement. There were also those interested in pressing the method of tax refusal. While Peacemakers had some influence, and it became a focus for Gandhian ideology for a time, it never became a large organization and finally fragmented into several interest groups.

Another effect of the beginning of peacetime conscription was to raise, for the first time publicly, the possibility of Negroes engaging in civil disobedience to the draft. A. Philip Randolph, Bayard Rustin and others formed the "Committee Against Jim Crow In The Armed Forces", urging Negroes to refuse to be drafted into segregated military units. While few Negroes responded to this appeal, the undertaking encouraged the idea of nonviolent action in the field of racial justice.

In 1949, the World Pacifist Conference was held in India. This occasion gave impetus to systematic thinking about the ideology, strategy, and future direction of a movement incorporating fundamental Gandhian ideas. It was recommended that satyagraha units be established in different countries. Key leaders developed personal relationships there which stood them in good stead as the movement has become more "internationalized".

The Korean War of 1950-53 had a far-reaching impact on the peace movement. Nationalism and chauvinism grew apace, McCarthyism emerged and a climate was produced where most of the nonpacifist periphery of the movement melted away. Furthermore, those peace organizations whose stock-in-trade were proposals for negotiation found it difficult to relate their strategies to political realities. Neither the government nor the public was much interested in negotiation, especially after the protracted efforts to end the Korean War.

For a while the arguments within the movement were centered on the issue of negotiated versus unilateral disarmament. This modulated into a full-scale debate over the basic orientation of the pacifist sector of the peace movement. It culminated in the publication in 1955 of a pamphlet by the American Friends Service Committee titled *Speak Truth to Power*, in which a reasoned case was set forth for the application of nonviolence to the politics of peace. What gradually took shape was the ascendancy of the "radical caucus" in the peace movement, in the sense that the politics of this group either prevailed in some organizations or in others gained substantially in influence. While some of the moderate groups were less than enthusiastic about direct action, there was a heartening degree of coordination, consultation and joint action by leaders and groups.

The next chapter had to do with direct action for peace and against military preparations or actions. In the late 1940s and early 1950s, there had been direct action projects and demonstrations in Washington, New York, Philadelphia and other cities. Frequently they were sponsored by an *ad hoc* committee of Peacemakers, Catholic Workers, Fellowship of Reconciliation, and the War Resisters' League.

Direct action for peace became a burgeoning effort starting in 1957. At the insistent urging of Lawrence Scott (himself deeply influenced by Gandhi) the peace organizations mobilized themselves for action against the threat of continued nuclear testing. At a meeting in Philadelphia, the groundwork was laid for the formation of two organizations, which later became the National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy (SANE) to work with liberals and moderates, and Nonviolent Action against Nuclear Weapons (NVA) to serve as a vehicle for radicals. It was agreed that more effective action would result if there were two organizations working in coordinate fashion rather than one organization in which a great deal of time and energy would be spent in resolving basic policy differences.

NVA first conducted "Nevada Action", an effort to protest the exploding of a test atom bomb in the Nevada desert. The second project was much more ambitious: the sailing into the Pacific test zone of a small 30-foot ketch, the *Golden Rule*, captained by former Naval officer Albert Bigelow. There followed Omaha Action, against the building of a missile base in Nebraska; and, most dramatically, the March from San Francisco to Moscow. In 1959, A J. Muste, Bayard Rustin and Bill Sutherland helped coordinate the Sahara Protest Team, an international group which demonstrated against French nuclear testing on the African continent. Following that came Polaris Action, organized as a long-term project in New London, Connecticut, the centre for building Polaris submarines capable of launching an atomic attack.

In the student field, the Student Peace Union was the group most friendly to Gandhian ideas. In the nation's Capital it mounted a large-scale demonstration of college and high school students committed to nonviolent discipline, which received widespread favourable comment.

The civil rights revolution of the past decade, beginning with the Supreme Court decision on school desegregation, was another major challenge to the peace forces. It was the latter who had pioneered in Gandhian methods, concentrating in the racial field, but relating this experience to other fields such as anti-colonialism in Africa. Nevertheless, their following in the South was very small, and few Negroes had recruited into the movement.

The name of Gandhi was often associated with the Montgomery Bus Protest and with Martin Luther King, Jr. However the impact of Gandhian ideas was indirect rather than direct. To most Negroes, Gandhi was only a name or a cartoonist's caricature.

Two meetings are recalled by King as notable in his spiritual pilgrimage to nonviolence. When he was a student at Crozer Seminary, he attended a lecture by A.J. Muste (which the author arranged) on the implications of nonviolence for the Christian church. While at the same Seminary he attended a monthly interracial and inter-religious meeting in Philadelphia where Mordecai Johnson, president of Howard University, gave a passionate and powerful address on the significance of Gandhi, having just returned from the World Pacifist Conference in India. Writes King, "His message was so profound and electrifying that I left the meeting and bought half a dozen books on Gandhi's life and works". As he delved into these books he concluded: "Love for Gandhi was a potent instrument for social and collective transformation. It was in this Gandhian emphasis on love and nonviolence that I discovered the method for social reform that I had been seeking for so many months . . . I came to feel that this was the only morally and practically sound method open to oppressed people in their struggle for freedom." At first he regarded it primarily as a valuable and potent instrument of struggle, but later he embraced nonviolence more completely and joined the pacifist Fellowship of Reconciliation.

Chester Bowles wrote a featured article in the mass circulation magazine *Saturday Evening Post* (March 1, 1958) on "What Negroes Can Learn From Gandhi". Two of the Negro college students who initiated the sit-in movement (Greensboro, North Carolina, 1960) told the author that one of the influences that impelled them to action was a television program on Gandhi. They saw jail going for a worthy cause in an entirely new light. Out of the sit-in movement grew the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee which incorporated nonviolence as a strategic commitment into their operational methods. A leading adult movement in the South is the Southern Christian Leadership Council, also committed to nonviolence.

Most of the civil rights leaders, both youth and adult, articulate their views not specifically in Gandhian terms but either in religious language (mostly Christian), as is more characteristic of the South, or in humanistic and pragmatic terms, as is more characteristic of the North. There are some who extend their nonviolence beyond the cause of racial justice and question other aspects of national life inimical to human welfare, especially some aspects of U.S. foreign policy. As one young leader said: "We have to hope for more than dying in an integrated bomb shelter".

There is some carry-over from the civil rights movement to an interest in peace. Among top civil rights leadership can be found a number who are interested in disarmament and oppose the military emphasis that characterizes U.S. foreign policy. Among them can be numbered Martin Luther King, A. Philip Randolph, Ralph Abernathy, John Lewis, and James Baldwin. James Farmer and Bayard Rustin have had a long-standing involvement in the peace movement. There are other younger leaders, along with rank-and-file youth, who are not aiming primarily at "a share of the American pie" but recognize that far-reaching transformations are required in American life and society if genuine democracy is to be realized, and if the United States is to be a worthy member of the community of nations.

The peace movement, it may be said, made two major contributions to the civil rights revolution in its first decade. One was through the organizational expertise of a few skilled and knowledgeable individuals such as Bayard Rustin, Glenn Smiley, James Lawson, and later James Farmer (with A.J. Muste's influence effectively in the background). Another important, if unheralded, contribution was that of interpretation of unfolding events in the civil rights struggle, by many people throughout the nation who understood the basic elements of the nonviolent approach, through their exposure to Gandhian ideas over the years and their allegiance to the religious pacifist position. This was true especially in the late 1950s.

In the colleges and universities there has been a continuing interest in Gandhi on the part of those interested in peace and social justice. He commands interest not only as an historical figure but also as one who has challenged many traditional American ideas. William Stuart Nelson, Vice-President of

Howard University who has visited India three times, teaches a course at Howard on "The Philosophy and Methods of Nonviolence". He has received numerous inquiries from other universities and has frequently lectured on Gandhi. A Gandhi Memorial Lecture is given annually at Howard. In connection with the 1963 lecture there was a large and impressive intercollegiate conference on "Youth, Nonviolence and Social Change".

At Haverford College there was in 1963 a research seminar on methods of nonviolent section. At Spelman College, Professor Staughton Lynd has taught a course on "History of Nonviolence in America". A number of courses in the general field of analysis of conflict deal with Gandhi, and one frequently reads and hears of graduate studies on Gandhi. The technical *Journal of Conflict Resolution* published at University of Michigan periodically carries articles on Gandhian ideas or motifs. A recent survey revealed a surprising amount of such explorations, and young people drawn to the peace movement get valuable background information and analysis through this medium.

Few Americans have attempted a systematic analysis of Gandhi's political or organizational ideas. In addition to Gregg mentioned earlier, there have been Joan Bondurant's *Conquest of Violence* subtitled "The Gandhian Philosophy of Conflict"; sections of Edmond Taylor's *Richer by Asia*; Vincent Sheean's *Lead Kindly Light*; Paul Power's *Gandhi on World Affairs*; and Louis Fischer's *Gandhi and Stalin.* It is highly likely there will be many more soon; they could help develop further the idea of revolutionary nonviolence expressed in the American idiom.

At the founding conference of the World Peace Brigade, held in Lebanon, and in its subsqeuent actions such as the Delhi-to-Peking Friendship March, there has been a valuable and fruitful interchange between leaders of Gandhian thought and action in India and in the West. Here an important beginning has been made in overcoming what appears to be a dichotomy: the emphasis in Western peace movements on war resistance and in India on the constructive program. The dichotomy is transcended in the idea of "nonviolent revolution" (or "revolutionary nonviolence") as the Statement of Principles and Aims of the World Peace Brigade indicates.

Gandhi's impact has always been most evident in the pacifist sector of the U.S. peace movement. Prior to World War II his appeal was in the world of ideas. He was a symbol of dedicated action, of a possible alternative to violent means of political and social change. It was not until after 1940 that groups began to adopt satyagraha as a mode of organizational operation. His impact may be summarized in a five-fold fashion:

1. *Methodology.* The method of satyagraha has already helped to change aspects of American life. It is likely that more experiments will emerge in the next couple of decades. They may result from a combination of organizational efforts of groups committed to Gandhian principles, and efforts by thinkers and scholars to correlate Gandhian ideas and experience with developments and ideas in the behavioral sciences.

2. *Principled Action.* The peace movement has been bombarded with charges of utopianism and perfectionism, and has sometimes been caught in an unconscious reaction: making too many concessions to what passes for political realism. Gandhi has been a relentless reminder of the importance of "right action" in politics.

3. *Leadership.* Gandhi's style of leadership was direct, person to person, unaffected. One deeply impressed by the life of Gandhi could hardly aspire to be a Big Shot of the American variety. Simplicity and directness are generally regarded as cardinal virtues in American peace leadership. It would seem that Gandhi's influence is one factor. As Dwight Macdonald put it, commenting on his ready availability to all: "He practised tolerance and love to such an extent that he seemed to have regarded the capitalist as well as the garbage man as his social equal!"

4. *Discipline.* Americans have usually been repelled by the idea of discipline. They have associated it with Puritan asceticism or Prussian militarism. There has also been negative experience in radical circles with manipulative discipline in some Marxist movements. Gandhi showed the creative uses of discipline in a way that has deeply impressed American exponents of nonviolence who reject authoritarianism but realize the weakness of undisciplined individualism.

5. *Constructive Program.* Resistance to an unjust social order

is unintelligible or even nihilistic unless it is linked to an interaction process leading to a new social order. U.S. Gandhians admit that the many constructive activities in which nonviolent actionists are involved are not sufficiently coordinated or integrated with a nonviolent revolutionary program. Gandhi's stress on the complementary nature of nonviolent resistance and a constructive program is an insistent guide-line in that regard.

Gandhi's impact will continue to be felt, probably in ways we cannot foresee. He drew upon the traditions and ideas deep within the soil and soul of India, integrating them into an unforgettable life. Likewise, each time nonviolence finds expression it draws upon the traditions, experience and patterns of thought of the culture in which it is working. So it will be in America, for the enduring legacy of Gandhi belongs not only to India but to the whole world and to all time.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. *The Gandhi Reader* edited by Homer A. Jack. Indiana University Press, 1956.
2. *Peaceful Agitator: The Story of A. J. Muste* by Nat Hentoff. Macmillan, 1963.
3. "A Strategy for Negroes" by Cranston Clayton, in *The World Tomorrow*, issue of January 18, 1934.
4. *Conquest of Violence* by Joan V. Bondurant. Princeton University Press, 1958.
5. "Gandhi" by Dwight Macdonald in *Politics*, Winter issue, 1948.
6. *Moral Man and Immoral Society* by Reinhold Niebuhr. Scribners, 1932.
7. *Gandhi on World Affairs* by Paul F. Power. Public Affairs Press, 1960.
8. *Richer by Asia* by Edmond Taylor. Houghton Mifflin, 1947.
9. *The Idea of Peace and War in Contemporary Philosophy* by Irving L. Horowitz. Paine-Whitman, 1957.
10. *The Power of Nonviolence* by Richard B. Gregg. Lippincott

1934; revised editions by Fellowship Publications in 1944 and 1959.

11. *Essay in Politics* by Scott Buchanan. Philosophical Library, 1953.

12. *Gandhi and Stalin* by Louis Fischer. Harper, 1947.

13. "Problems of Nonviolent Revolution" by A.J. Muste. *Peacemaker*, 1950?.

14. *Speak Truth to Power* by the American Friends Service Committee, 1955.

15. *Stride Toward Freedom* by Martin Luther King, Jr. Harper, 1958.

16. *When Negroes March* by Herbert Garfinkel. Free Press, 1959.

17. *Teaching about Peace Issues* published by the Studies Program of the Peace Education Division, American Friends Service Committee, 1964.

18. *I Speak for Myself* by John Haynes Holmes. Harper, 1959.

19. *Lead Kindly Light* by Vincent Sheean. Random House, 1949.

NONVIOLENCE AND MISSISSIPPI

A. J. Muste

This article is in the first instance an appeal to those, Negro and white, who are taking part in the movement for civil rights in the United States today. It is an appeal that in considering how to deal with the agonizing and complicated problems which now beset us the emphasis shall be on nonviolence, i.e. on maintaining the spirit of nonviolence in the movement and in devising apt and imaginative applications of a basically nonviolent strategy.

During the long hot summer of 1964, about which we had been warned or with which we had been threatened, the violence and tension were focussed largely on Mississippi where three young men who volunteered to work in the COFO[1] campaign for voter registration and related objectives simply disappeared. It was in Mississippi that Medgar W. Evers, the devoted and highly respected organizer of the N.A.A.C.P., was brutally assassinated. No one has been convicted of that crime in the courts of that state. It was in Jackson, Mississippi, that the widow of Medgar Evers at his memorial service said to her fellow-Negroes and fellow-workers, "We must not hate, we must love". What I am trying to say in what follows is that this statement must be the light that guides the movement in the dark passages and the motto on its banners as it moves into the light.

I have on many other occasions spoken to the white people in the United States, including, the South, and including the churches, about their sin, guilt, provincialism, brutality, addiction to violence, apathy, deep-rooted prejudice. There is no time here to do this once more and I trust it is not necessary in order to avoid misunderstanding.

To urge that the emphasis now be on further developing a nonviolent strategy rather than abandoning or diluting it, is not to urge retreat or "moderation" or reducing the militancy of the struggle. It is meant to be, and in my opinion can be in practice, exactly the opposite, viz. the means to maintain and intensify the dynamism and drive of the integration movement.

Whatever one's explanation or political evaluation may be, the fact is that on the part of Negroes and their supporters the struggle for civil rights has been to an amazing degree nonviolent. The violence has been overwhelmingly on the part of the police, sheriffs, and other supposed guardians of the peace and individuals or groups who "took the law into their own hands", when Negroes demonstrated peacefully. Typically, this happens when the police give the green light to such elements and indicate that they will be looking the other way if demonstrators are attacked, churches and homes bombed, etc. Violence on the part of Negroes has in fact been negligible.

But beyond this, the contemporary movement as typified by Martin Luther King, Jr., James Farmer, Bayard Rustin, James Lawson, and multitudes of others, has as such been committed to a nonviolent or Gandhian strategy. The large older-established organizations, such as the Urban League and N.A.A.C.P., if not in the same sense committed to nonviolence, have certainly not in any way resorted to violent methods. Throughout the world, the integration movement as a whole has been hailed as by far the most notable instance of nonviolent strategy since the Gandhian movement for Indian independence. Moreover, many of the leaders and rank and file members have identified themselves as believing in nonviolence not only as sound social strategy, but as a way of life and as the basis of that "beloved community" in which human beings can be truly human, the society to which the prophets have pointed and which in some very deep sense is at the heart of the civil rights movement. "Deep in my heart, I do believe, we shall overcome some day"—overcome not the white man but that which stands in the way of man.

It can also be safely asserted that such gains as have been made by the civil rights movement have come about basically by the use of the nonviolent approach, whether by the more conventional tactics of N.A.A.C.P. and the Urban League or by direct action and civil disobedience. All these tendencies have insisted that the issue was a *moral* one and have appealed to the *conscience* of leaders and people. The moral revulsion which swept the country when firehoses and cattle prods were turned on women and children and four girls were murdered in a Birmingham church on a Sunday morning had a good deal to do with the (belated) introduction of the civil rights bill and its passage, and with the important upsurge of college youth in support of civil rights. One need only reflect for a moment to realize how different the reaction would have been if incidents like those just mentioned had taken place in the context of a series of pitched battles between Negroes and whites, or between Negroes and the police. The sporadic violence into which Negroes were occasionally goaded at the sight of the brutality wreaked on women and children was, on the other hand, understandable and did not dilute the moral revulsion, in spite of all the efforts of segregationists to build up an image of Negro violence and to put the onus of "provoking" violence on peaceful demonstrators.

Nonviolence Remains a Sound Strategy

As I have argued in another paper[2], regardless of whether this happens to be in line with one's philosophical or religious views, the integration movement as such in the United States and under existing circumstances has to remain essentially nonviolent. More specifically, this means, on the one hand, making use of such means as the nation's legislative, judicial and executive setup provides for removing discrimination and achieving conditions which promote equality. It means, on the other hand, that when direct action is resorted to, as it certainly has to be, when Negroes and their supporters "take to the streets", the action has to be essentially along nonviolent or Gandhian lines.

In the first place, indispensable as the demand for freedom by the Negro people and their refusal any longer to submit to discrimination or to be intimidated are, it is apparent they cannot achieve even a measure of genuine, as against token, integration by themselves. They have to have the support of labour and other elements. The integration movement does not yet have that labour support except in a very limited degree. To take to violence ("self-defence" so called) under these circumstances, is self-defeating and adventurist, a gesture of frustration, rather than facing up to a problem.

More basically, as an increasing number of scholars and activists are coming to understand, civil rights can be achieved only as part of a "triple revolution" which takes in also the issue of "jobs" in the era of automation and cybernation, and the issue of "weaponry" or peace in the era of nuclear warfare. Even if one thinks that this "triple revolution" should be carried through eventually on the historic pattern of revolutions based on a violent transfer of power (a position which I do not hold), then one is still confronted with the plain fact that no such revolution is imminent in the United States, nor does any agency to effect such a revolution and "take over" after it occurs exist. To behave in a sector of the total field, such as civil rights; and in a specific location, such as Mississippi, as if one were in such a revolutionary period is, again, irrational and suicidal. It is, therefore, suicidal for integrationists in the rightful and necessary pursuit of their own concrete objectives to be diverted from helping to build the forces that will achieve the "triple revolution" into the adventurism of violent shortcuts.

There is still one other aspect of the situation which I shall merely allude to—though it is of utmost importance in my opinion. I mean the deep psychological (largely irrational) roots of racism and of many aspects of the relation between the races in this country. It is the knowledge as well as verdict of any reputable expert that such sicknesses are not cured by violence or in an atmosphere of violence.

The slowness of the progress towards genuine integration, the frustrations encountered in achieving obvious and substantial results through demonstrations or even such mild activities as voter registration have led to increasing demands for police protection and especially for the intervention of federal marshals and federal troops. This is now a central problem. Before tackling it, however, it may be necessary to comment on a proposal that is, I understand, receiving some consideration, viz. that civil rights demonstrators have to provide their own "security" or "protection" in some situations, especially the bad ones like Mississippi. This means that voter registration volunteers themselves or people who accompany them should be armed and prepared to shoot in self-defence. As a pacifist, I of course abhor and reject such a proposal. Apart from that, I have argued in a previous paper already mentioned that this proposal cannot be equated with "self-defence" on the part of an individual in the general context of American law and mores. It is a social or political tactic. I think it could well be that in some specific situation at a given moment the fact that a person threatened with attack in a rural county in the South had a gun and indicated he was ready to use it might for the time being help him from being abducted or killed and enable him to get away. But to adopt a general strategy of arming the volunteers or their guards, or arming the Negro community, is an entirely different proposition. It is not something to play games with. How far are those who advance this kind of proposal willing to go? Such proposals seem to me either to assume a "revolutionary" situation which we do not have in the U.S. or to spring out of psychological frustrations which should not determine the political policy of a movement. It should, of course, be understood that none of the leading civil rights organizations entertains such proposals.

Calling in Federal Forces

The idea of calling in the state or federal police is another matter. From their point of view it *is* the clear duty of the police and civil authorities generally to protect peaceful demonstrators and people engaged in lawful missions from lawless attacks by individuals or mobs. This is the dictate of common sense and of a sense of social justice. It has repeatedly been backed by the Supreme Court, so it is the "Law of the land". It seems obviously legitimate to bring this responsibility to the attention of the civil authorities. People who are not pacifists and hold the prevailing views about police protection would seem to have a clear duty to exert themselves to secure proper exercise of the local police authority and failing that to work for their replacement in such ways as society has provided.

The question whether nonviolent activists should *seek* such protection and make federal intervention, including use of the military establishment, a major part of their strategy—which has often lately tended to be the case—is another matter.

The safety of a defenceless individual at the moment he is being attacked is a matter of the deepest concern to any other individual present who is not bereft of his reason. Insensitivity at this point, as shown quite often recently not only in connection with racial struggles but in other cases of brutal attack, and not only in Mississippi but in New York, is a shocking manifestation of psychic illness. However, the question whether a particular means does in fact "protect" the individual and others has also to be faced and the proposition that violence does in fact overcome violence may be and needs to be questioned.

Nonviolent volunteers may go into a conflict unarmed of their volition and in that sense would be defenceless. But the fact is that the individual soldier in large numbers, even in "brush-fire wars", not to mention the bigger ones which the big nations wage, is also defenceless. He is not guaranteed safety, quite the contrary. What he has is the possibility to inflict mutilation or death also on others. But this is precisely what the civil rights volunteers do not seek.

To turn to certain specific problems: what does the record show about the result of bringing in outside forces, which is what it comes to since the problem arises because local authorities do not discharge the normal function of maintaining public order? The record hardly provides unequivocal support for outside intervention. In Cambridge, Maryland, what seemed to have happened was that "public order" had been imposed in a superficial sense and in the civil rights struggle a stalemate, not progress, had ensued. In the State of Arkansas, in which Little Rock is located, no outstanding results have been achieved in the civil rights struggle which can be charged to the armed intervention to which Eisenhower finally resorted, having consistently failed to take his stand on civil rights as a moral issue. Witness John W. Fulbright, the highly intelligent Senator from that state, pleading that he "had" to vote against the civil rights bill, or Faubus, the segregationist Governor of Arkansas, would defeat him. I recall, to look at the matter from an opposite angle, that the one period when there were notable public defections from the ultra-right organizations was during the moral revulsion against hate and violence which swept the country at the time of the Kennedy assassination.

When it comes to a situation like Mississippi, I find that those who are close to it and whose judgement I rely on point out that "limited violence" or bringing in a limited number of federal marshals is not likely to meet the situation. Thus a relatively conservative organization such as N.A.A.C.P. calls on the federal government to take over control in Mississippi, which means the use of the armed forces. If such an approach leads to anything like open, even if limited, civil war, what will have been gained? How will the cause of civil rights, in that state, have been advanced, not to mention the healing of the deep psychological sickness with which many are afflicted?

What does "taking over" eventually mean? Putting federal marshals into every city, town and rural area? How will they enforce law against the will of the local population? And which laws will they apply, those passed by the Mississippi legislature? If not, how do they abrogate or set aside such laws? Does the federal government appoint a new legislature, instal a new governor, or provide for new elections in which the "right" kind of officials are chosen? If so, how is that to be managed? The more one reflects on what can come out of an effort to take a state over by such means, the more fantastic the idea seems. Can this really be identified as "democratic process"?

If the U.S. army in effect "rescues" the civil rights cause in Mississippi, or appears to, what effect will that have on the thinking of Negroes and their supporters if the Johnson administration is drawn deeper into the war in Vietnam and perhaps to a larger war in Southeast Asia generally? What attention, for that matter, are civil rights workers giving at this time to the crucial situation in that part of the world?

If in the face of all such considerations, such projects as COFO had been carrying on in Mississippi and other dynamic efforts are pursued, we are driven to ask the question whether a more thorough and "pure" application of the nonviolent approach should not be devised.

Without having been able to carry on a series of discussions about them in advance, I set down a number of suggestions as to what a more earnest and consistent application of nonviolence would or might mean in a situation like Mississippi.

Applications of Nonviolence

(1) The nonviolent approach is in one aspect based on the use and efficacy of moral force (Gandhi's term was "soul-force") as against physical force or violence. President Johnson has made on the whole an admirable record in the matter of civil rights. He has even ventured into places like Atlanta to plead that integration is a moral issue. He has exerted moral force in this way. Subsequently he was urged in various quarters to send troops into Mississippi. Sending troops is an essentially political act. An essentially moral act would have been for President Johnson not to send troops but to take upon himself responsibility for going to Jackson personally in order to confer with Governor Paul B. Johnson, Jr., to meet the editors of the State, the clergy, perhaps the lawyers, the civil rights volunteers, and so on. This would not be primarily on the technical issue of law enforcement, but on the basic human and moral issue with which not only Mississippi but the whole nation is now confronted, according to Mr Johnson's own declarations.

(2) It is foreign to nonviolence to seek a victory over other human beings in a war in which one group of humans is arrayed against another. The aim is not to conquer and humiliate the "enemy" but to change his mind and will. The system or institutional pattern in which people are involved—whatever the prevailing pattern of domination and subordination may be at a given time—is conceived as something which traps, harms, degrades all who live under it. This means, as Martin Luther King, Jr. has put it more than once, that the aim of the civil rights movement is to "liberate" the South, not only to liberate Negroes.

I am well aware that there are many in the current movement in Mississippi who share these views. However, they are by no means universally held and I am suggesting that more effort be put into cultivating this attitude in all civil rights workers and in trying to. communicate to Mississippians that this is the spirit which motivates the movement for equality.

(3) I take it that Quakers are doing this to some extent, but my own experiences recently in Georgia in some sections of which conditions are not too dissimilar from Mississippi, have given me a strong conviction that more effort should be put into attempts to set up communication between members of the white and Negro communities. This involves a patient effort to locate the members of the white community, clergy and lay, who have a measure of sensitivity and intelligence. They are consequently inwardly disturbed, but ordinarily for motives creditable and not creditable, they do not act and speak. Yet time and thought need to begin reaching these people. They will largely determine in the end what happens in the local community. I do not mean by that to rule out or deprecate the role of the "outside agitator", having been one most of my life. The polarization and absence of communication are to be reckoned with as a fact; they must not be accepted as the basis on which warfare is to be waged.

(4) One hesitates to raise the point of "protection" and "defence" in face of the brutality so often witnessed in many Southern localities. And I have repeatedly pointed out that it is the duty of the authorities, by their own professed standards and the law of the land, to provide peaceful demonstrators with protection. It is legitimate for citizens who accept these premises to insist that the protection be provided. But it is not a part of the nonviolent strategy or ethos to ask for protection which ultimately rests on violence to restrain violence. Nonviolence means to go unarmed and in that sense to be defenceless. This also means not having arms—one's own or that of the police or the army, *in reserve somewhere.* It means to take suffering upon oneself and to avoid inflicting it in any way on others.

I am, therefore, proposing that the practice of calling on the police and especially on troops for protection be abandoned by the civil rights movement. To be consistent I think we have to adopt that course in relation to Mississippi. Let the authorities face up to their own responsibilities but let us operate on our own assumptions and our own nonviolent ethic. I firmly believe myself that it may well be the only way in which Mississippi can in fact be *disarmed* and *transformed.*

There is a sense in which young people ought to have "protection", though they have made it magnificently clear that they are not looking for an easy life. Is it out of the question to ask decent Mississippians to act as escorts for each team of volunteers? Or the parents or other relatives of the volunteers might act in that capacity. Or clergy in pairs from various parts of the country. I gather that some of these ideas are already being considered.

More Aggressive Nonviolence

There are two final observations. One of the reasons, in my opinion, why nonviolence has become obnoxious to many Negroes is a pattern often followed in civil rights struggles. When the struggle in a city like Birmingham reaches the point where a significant breakthrough seems imminent, the powers that be become tougher and more violent. They accuse the nonviolent leaders of provoking violence and that any blood if it is shed will be on their hands. The latter are deeply troubled. The outcome is the setting up of a bi-racial committee which is to work out steps toward integration. The struggle is thus relaxed or even initially abandoned. And nothing happens. I suggest this pattern be avoided in the future. The struggle should be maintained until some specific steps towards integration are assured.

Secondly, the typical struggle involves large numbers but is usually at a low level of intensity, in the sense that leaders and rank and file expect to be bailed out promptly, with the result that very large amounts of money are tied up indefinitely which has a crippling effect financially on future activities. A sounder nonviolent strategy would be to refuse to put up bail or spend large sums on trials, to remain in jail, for those able to do so to fast or go on hunger strike, and so on. This in turn would deeply stir the community, Negro and, at least to some extent, also the white, and would contribute towards the political force and effectiveness of the movement.

What has appeared up to this point was written before the adoption of the civil rights bill. It is obviously too early to make a definite analysis of the effects of its adoption and of the way it is or is not being enforced. Nevertheless the first impact of the new situation, the post-adoption period, has occurred and we cannot avoid trying to make a provisional assessment of what this means for future strategy.

It seems to me clear that the adoption of the bill, whatever its shortcomings, is a notable gain. We have only to think for a moment where we should now be if a filibuster were on and the bill had failed of adoption. By no stretch of the imagination can the adoption be laid to violence on the part of the integration movement. It is the fruit of a militantly nonviolent struggle.

There are dramatic instances such as that of the businessmen and Mayor Allen C. Thompson of Jackson, Mississippi, standing together "against the White Citizen's Council in a decision to comply with the Civil Rights Act". Peaceful integration of hotels, motels and restaurants has, "to the surprise of many of the Mississippians", as the New York *Times* reports, actually taken place. I think of another example, close to myself and the whole nonviolent movement, in which such organizations as the War Resister's League and the Committee for Nonviolent Action are involved, viz. Albany, Georgia. Reports from the scene there reveal that there also integration of hotels and eating places has taken place without incident, and the atmosphere is on the whole relaxed! It is difficult for anyone who was close to the ordeal which the Quebec-Washington-Guantanamo Peace Walkers experienced in Albany earlier in 1964 to believe that this could possibly be true; yet it is.

Without going into further detail, it is clear that in so far as any conclusion can be drawn from the latest developments they point to the application of a militant and imaginative strategy of nonviolence. They certainly give no support to an abandonment of that strategy.

Violence as the Enemy

The civil rights movement has its own task and must deal with the problems and dilemmas which spring directly from it. However, its leaders and many of its members already are aware of the fact that civil rights in a meaningful and decisive degree can be achieved only in the context of a Triple Revolution which will also solve the problem of jobs and the problem of peace. Both have to be solved, obviously, for all; there is no such thing as a solution for some and not for others.

The problem of "peace" relates to the relations between nations in the era of nuclear technology. But it relates to much more. Any force of "violence" that has social dimensions and implications takes on new evil meaning because it may "escalate" into war, get out of hand and bring on the danger of extinguishing civilization, if not the race itself. Furthermore, as daily events testify, alongside refinements in modern culture, we are confronted with frustration, alienation, swift change apparently beyond human control, and consequently with violence in many forms. It can no longer be considered a minor matter for those seeking to combat the "anti-human" in any form whether violence is to be resorted to for the sake of a seemingly good and necessary end or whether a decision for or against violence itself is now basic for every human being and especially for committed devotees of any "cause".

The great French novelist, philosopher and hero of the Resistance, Albert Camus, some time ago came to the conclusion that the latter is indeed the case. In 1947 he wrote an essay which states the challenge to break with murder and violence and suggests how that may be done. His is a voice that will be listened to not without a measure of respect on both or all sides of the lines that divide men into warring camps and sometimes lead to a proliferation of violence on many levels which make us wonder whether mankind is dominated by a wish to die. The essay is entitled "Neither Victims Nor Executioners".[3] Crudely put, it points out that in a world saturated in violence we may not have a choice as to whether or not to be victims but we can still choose not to be executioners. "For my part", he concludes, "I am fairly sure that I have made the choice. . . . I will never again be one of those, whoever they be, who compromise with murder." The basic decision that must be made, he elaborates, is "whether humanity's lot must be made still more miserable in order to achieve far-off and shadowy ends, whether we should accept a world bristling with arms where brother kills brother; or whether, on the contrary, we should avoid bloodshed and misery as much as possible so that we give a chance for survival to later generations better equipped than we are".

Camus in 1947 assumed that only a few at first would take the course of rejecting murder as a social instrument and embracing nonviolence, the course of "discovering a style of life". Even so he felt that precisely such a minority would exhibit a "positively dazzling realism". But may it not be that in the nuclear age multitudes on both sides of barriers may indeed be driven both by necessity—the need for bare survival—and by moral passion, to commit themselves to nonviolence?

Even Camus a decade or so ago could not reject the possibility of such a development and accordingly concluded his essay with this beautiful expression of hope that "the thirst for fraternity which burns in Western man" might be satisfied. He wrote: "Over the expanse of five continents throughout the coming years an endless struggle is going to be pursued between violence and friendly persuasion, a struggle in which granted, the former has a thousand times the chance of success than the latter. But I have always held that, if he who bases his hope on human nature is a fool, he who gives up in the face of circumstances is a coward."

---

1. Committee of Federated Organizations (working for civil rights in Mississippi, U.S.A.).
2. "Rifle Squads or the Beloved Community", Reprint, *Liberation* magazine, 5 Beckman St., New York, N Y., U.S.A.
3. Available in pamphlet form from *Liberation* magazine, 5 Beekman St., New York, N.Y., U.S.A.

ASPECTS OF NONVIOLENCE IN AMERICAN CULTURE

Mulford Q. Sibley

American culture, it is sometimes said, has been peculiarly violent, both in outlook and in practice. It has exalted physical force, praised rough action, and placed in the fore-front such cynical statements as "Fear God and keep your powder dry". One of America's leading Presidents[1] is well-known for his advice to "speak softly but carry a big stick". Violence has been associated with the frontier spirit, the Westward movement, treatment of the American Indian, the rise of business corporations, and the development of labour organizations. Violent crimes are more numerous proportionately than in most other nations of the world; and the police, by contrast with those in Britain, are heavily armed. Popular culture, moreover, if we are to take radio, television, cinema, and pulp magazines as indicators, exults in violence.

Now all this is in some measure true. Yet there is another side, which is the theme of this paper. Obviously an essay of this length can only hint at certain aspects of the tradition of nonviolence—the notion of principled nonviolence in early American religious thought and practice; elements of nonviolence in the theory of federalism; the struggle against compromise in the American peace movement; nonviolence and American labour; and nonviolence in the struggle for social justice, particularly in the movement for racial desegregation.

Early American Religious Thought and Practice

Explicit doctrines and practice of nonviolence were reflected during the seventeenth century, when Mennonites and Quakers (the Society of Friends)—two important heterodox sects of the Protestant Reformation—settled in the colony of Pennsylvania. The Quaker William Penn was granted the colony by Britain's King Charles II and because religious toleration became the watchword of Pennsylvania, it attracted groups like the Mennonites who sought refuge from persecution in Europe.

The Mennonites were part of the great Anabaptist movement, which had been so bitterly attacked by the orthodox during the sixteenth century. Theologically, mennonite doctrine had much in common with Lutheranism, in that it tended to dichotomize the world into the Kingdom of Grace—that in which the saved lived—and the Kingdom of Power, which was ordained by God to control the unsaved through coercive and therefore violent political relations. But whereas the Lutheran believed that the good Christian had to serve in both realms, the Mennonite tended to attempt to separate them. Thus while the Lutheran said that one must observe the Sermon on the Mount[2] in private relations of Christians, one was equally obliged, when the State called, to serve in the army, go to war, and execute criminals. Mennonites, while recognizing the Christian's obligation to obey the State passively[3] in matters that did not involve direct taking of human life, felt that on the whole the life of pure "grace" could best be kept free from violence if believers lived separately from the world in largely-agricultural communities.

Mennonites held that all active participation in politics would impair their testimony against violence. Hence, while they paid taxes, in accordance with what they believed to be the New Testament command,[4] they refused to serve as magistrates, policemen, jurors, or soldiers. Theirs, we might say, was an ethic of withdrawal; or, as they themselves have dut it, one of *non-resistance* rather than of *nonviolent resistanc*.[5] In their early Pennsylvania communities they had an influence on American life far out of proportion to their numbers; for although they did not believe that the political world could be redeemed by human effort—it would remain violent, corrupt, and coercive to the end of time—their personal example of inoffensiveness was undoubtedly important.[6]

Pennsylvania Quakers, by contrast, tended to believe that political and group as well as personal relations could be redeemed. It was possible, through appropriate institutions and positive action, to engulf evil indirectly, or, in the words of the New Testament, to "overcome evil with good".[7] Quaker political principles were reflected in William Penn's organization of Pennsylvania. There was no army or militia; the death penalty was virtually abolished, in a day when more than 200 crimes were punishable by hanging in Britian; religious toleration was guaranteed; the Assembly, relative to seventeenth century practice, was democratically based; and jails were to be rehabilitative rather than punitive. Relations with American Indian tribes were to be on a plane of absolute equity: compensation for lands purchased was generous; white men were forbidden to peddle liquor among the tribes; and fear was reduced by the disarmed state of the colony.[8]

These were among the main features of what Penn called the "Holy Experiment". In considerable measure, the faith of those who initiated it seems to have been vindicated by actual results. For about 70 years—from its foundation in 1682 to shortly before Quakers withdrew from the colonial Assembly (which they controlled) in 1755—there were no Indian wars, even though all the other American colonies were troubled by them. Despite its disarmament—Quakers would probably have said largely because of it—the colony was, in relative terms, a model of order and peace. It is said that throughout this long period, only one Quaker was killed by an Indian—and he had made the mistake, in a weak moment, of obtaining a gun.

In general, we may say that Quakers implicitly accepted the conception of *nonviolent resistance*, rather than the Mennonite idea of *non-resistance*. Thus on one occasion, Quaker judges resisted by resigning their offices, to indicate their opposition to a law which they deemed unjust. Individual Quakers refused to obey illegal statutes and the Assembly itself at many points resisted royal requests for money to support armies.

As the colony grew, it became more heterogeneous and eventually consisted mainly of men not devoted to Quaker principles of nonviolence. Under these circumstances—and under an increasing pressure to make unacceptable compromises—Quakers eventually decided that they should withdraw from the Assembly. Thus ended the Holy Experiment.

Although Pennsylvania Quakers have often been rightly criticized for certain inconsistencies in conduct, the great experiment in nonviolence still stands out as one of man's noblest efforts. Many will agree with Thomas Jefferson[9] in calling Penn "the greatest lawgiver the world has produced . . . in parallelism with whose institutions, to name the dreams of a Minos, or Solon, or the military or monkish establishments of a Lycurgus, is truely an abandonment of all regard to the only legitimate object of government, the happiness of men".

Nonviolence and the Theory of Federalism

In Pennsylvania, a careful distinction was made between nonkilling force discriminately applied under law, on the one hand, and military force, together with war, on the other. Pennsylvania Quakers accepted the legitimacy of genuine police work but rejected what they thought of as the almost inevitably destructive and indiscriminately applied force associated with war. The latter they associated with violence.

In the formulation of the Federal Constitution in 1787 a similar, although not identical, issue was posed: should provision be made, in implementing decisions of the national government, for military coercion of States? After debate, the Convention came to the conclusion that the answer must be "No". Forcible sanctions were to be available against individuals but not against States as such.

The basis for this decision was the contention that States as such could not be coerced without undergoing serious risk of war. To embody in the Federal Constitution such a notion would, therefore, defeat one of the major ends of the union itself—order and public peace. The principle of coercion of States would have provided a remedy far worse in its effects than the disease to be cured.[10]

The framers of the American Constitution seem to have reasoned wisely, in terms of historical experience. Whether in federal unions (early nineteenth century Switzerland is an example) or in international organizations, inclusion of the idea of military threats against States seems to have been both unworkable and an incitement to violence. If we are to build a genuine world community in the twentieth century, this lesson must be learned. Although it may not take us far in the philosophical discussion of violence, and nonviolence, it will surely make no slight contribution to our never-ending quest of forms of organization which will minimize violence in practice.

Nonviolence and Compromise in the American Peace Movement

The organized peace movement in the United States dates from the late twenties of the nineteenth century. Its history is complex. Here, however, we concentrate on the perennial conflict between "relativists" and "absolutists"; between those who hold that while war in general is to be repudiated, some wars may be necessary, and those who maintain that no war can ever be justified.[11]

The discussion began early in the last century when some advocates of international peace—notably the Rev. John Lathrop in 1814—attempted to make a distinction between "aggressive" and "defensive" wars. The argument was deemed invalid by men like David Low Dodge, who often based their opposition to all war, in part at least, on what they thought had been the moral degradation which followed even the allegedly defensive American Revolutionary War.[12] The efforts of absolutists like Thomas S. Grimke, a lawyer and judge, eventually led the influential American Peace Society in 1837 to reject the relativist position.

Many of the absolutists, however, were also vigorously opposed to slavery and when the Civil War came they were confronted by the dilemma of whether to support the war ostensibly being fought against slavery or to reject it as utterly contrary to their pacifist principles. Some of those reckoned as pre-war absolutists shifted to the relativist position: this was true, for example, of William Lloyd Garrison, the great abolitionist, and of James Russell Lowell, who during the Mexican War had called war "murder . . . plain and flat".[13] Even Henry David Thoreau, who had refused to pay his poll taxes during the Mexican War and whose *Civil Disobedience* is one of the classics of nonviolent resistance, supported the war supposedly fought against slavery. On the other hand, the remarkable self-educated blacksmith and scholar of Greek, Elihu Burritt, one of the greatest of the absolutists,[14] refused to be deceived: just as he opposed the use of violence in the great nineteenth century European revolutions, while agreeing with many of their ends, so he declined to endorse the Civil War. Burritt advocated use of the disciplined nonviolent general strike as one means of emancipation from social injustice of all types.

After the Civil War and down to our own day, the basic conflict between absolutist and relativist positions has continued. By and large, the great bulk of the peace movement has been relativist: like the proverbial vegetarian between meals, it has been against war only between wars. When, for example, absolutist organisations like the Universal Peace Union opposed the Spanish leaders of American War in 1898, they were boycotted by respectable the peace movement.

After World War I, the burden of carrying on the absolutist position passed to relatively small organisations like the Fellowship of Reconciliation (founded during World War I), the War Resisters' League, and the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom (one of whose founders was the eminent American social worker, Jane Addams).

Intellectually, the absolutist stand was greatly strengthened between World War I and II by the writings of men like C.M. Case and Richard Gregg, the former a sociologist and the latter a lawyer.[15] Case emphasized that nonviolent resistance, however much it might be differentiated from violence, was still a form of coercion; Gregg endeavoured to understand some of the psychological ramifications of nonviolent attitudes.

The days immediately before World War II were characterized by contradictory tendencies. On the one hand, there was great enthusiasm in colleges and churches for the peace movement in general and a not inconsiderable interest in nonviolence as a principle. Thousands of ministers of religion said they would never support another war and college students were taking the so-call Oxford pledge never to bear arms. On the other hand, it was precisely at this time that doctrines of men like Reinhold Niebuhr were beginning to reinforce the relativist position by developing a "realistic" ethics and politics that termed pacifism "utopian" and therefore irrelevant.[16]

In the end, when World War II came, most of those who had sworn that they would never again support another war did in fact do so, as their ancestors had done in the Civil War and in World War I. There may have been as many as 100,000 conscientious objectors of registration age; but in comparison with the millions who were either supporters of or acquiescers in the war, this was a pitiably small number indeed. Once more, most Americans, sincerely no doubt, believed that however much one might repudiate military violence in general, one must support this particular war.

Since World War II, perhaps the most significant development has been the increasing awareness by scientists of the political implications involved in the use of modern weapons. Although most have not yet accepted views which could be identified with the absolutist position, there can be little doubt that the military technology of the post-war period added a new dimension to the old issues central to the ethic of nonviolence.[17]

How, absolutists of mid-century were asking themselves, can believers in nonviolence help shape the policies of the most powerful and most highly armed nation in history? Although the answer was not always certain, it was being asked by some of the most dedicated absolutists in the entire history of the American peace movement.

Nonviolence and Labour

The vital role which organized labour must necessarily play in highly industrialized societies makes its attitude to violence and nonviolence of unusual importance. Two contradictory tendencies have been present in American labour. On the one hand, its lack of political sophistication and difficulty of gaining recognition have all too frequently involved it in the violence of a capitalist culture. On the other hand, it is from certain leaders of labour, active as they are in the practical day-to-day problems of negotiating agreements and considering strikes, that some of the best insights into the power of nonviolence have come.

Legal recognition and protection of the right to organize and bargain collectively were won only after much travail: the story begins early in the nineteenth century, when labour organization was ruled a "conspiracy" under common law, and extends to the passage of the National Labour Relations Act during the presidency of Franklin D. Roosevelt. Since Roosevelt, problems of large-scale organisation and bureaucracy, jurisdictional conflicts, and leadership issues have provided new temptations to violence.

During the period between the Civil War and the New Deal, business corporations often stooped to almost any methods to control labour, not excluding private police, professional strike breakers, and actual physical force. It is not surprising that in this context workers often resorted to violence in retaliation, particularly since the corporations were so frequently supported by public authority.

In part, the tendency of labour to sometimes turn to violence was, as Robert Hunter argued,[18] the result of its lack of political sophistication. Despite the arguments of Socialists within its ranks, it refused to develop an independent political movement which might have related its own immediate interests to long-run considerations of fundamental public policy. Its very lack of commitment to revolutionary change subjected it to the imperatives of an often violent culture. Even the sit-down strikes of the thirties (in industrial Michigan), which might have become the inspiration for a philosophy of nonviolent power, were marred by acts of violence. Although the industrial union movement (Congress of Industrial Organizations) helped remove some of the frustrations of an American labour organization hitherto dominated by narrow craft unionism, the very rapidity of growth which resulted, combined with continued absence of an over-all political philosophy for guidance, subjected post-World-War II American labour to many stresses. Sometimes labour organizations were allied with the under-world of violent crime; and on occasion certain leaders resorted to violence to maintain their own power or that of their organizations.

But the other side of the picture is also important. In the early days, many were impressed by the way in which German socialists resisted—largely by nonviolent methods—the repressive legislation of Bismarck; and they noted the comment of Wilhelm Liebknecht that "moral force" had preserved the integrity of the labour and socialist movement. To some extent, the ideology of the general strike, which had its devotees in the United States, exalted the principle of nonviolent coercion. The novelist Jack London, in a graphic essay,[19] portrayed a vision of what the general strike might do to paralyze the whole machinery of industry and government without firing a shot, thus inaugurating a truly nonviolent revolution.

Several American anarchist theorists, too, thought that both labour and society in general were to be emancipated primarily through political enlightenment and passive resistance to social wrong. Thus Benjamin Tucker, a well-known individualist anarchist, maintained that while governments can usually quell violent resistance, no army can in the long run defeat men who simply stay home from the polling booths, refuse to enter the army, firmly and peacefully demonstrate, or decline to pay taxes.[20]

From a more orthodox point of view, Tom Mooney, a well-known American labour martyr, observed: "Violence is the weapon used by the employers. Violence wins no strike . . . only education and organization."[21] Other labour leaders from time to time have repeated his sentiments, contending that the greater the violence, the less likely it is that a strike will be successful. And in post-World-War II America, as a matter of fact, most spokesmen for labour would undoubtedly have endorsed this position.

Although American labour itself had not by the post-war epoch developed a general philosophy of nonviolence (as contrasted with more or less pragmatic observations), the idea of the perfectly nonviolent and self-disciplined strike had become a model for the thinking of those, like R.B. Gregg (himself a lawyer interested in labour matters), who had worked out such a philosophy.

To the student of nonviolence observing labour in the sixties of the twentieth century, a number of questions might occur. Was there a chance that, under stress of rapid technological change, labour might at long last develop an overall political philosophy that would embrace a theory of nonviolence? Could it re-think its position vis-a-vis an American State so committed to preparation for war? Could it come to realize its vast potentialities for leading American society away from notions of military defence to conceptions of nonviolent resistance to invasion —conceptions that might well rely on its own experience of the strike? The possibilities appeared so great; yet the vision, on the whole, remained so narrow.

Social Justice: the Negro Struggle and Nonviolence

As for nonviolence and the struggle for racial justice, it had its antecedents in earlier movements and particularly in the conflict for the emancipation of women. After first turning to respectable methods without many results, women like Alice Paul, who had been brought up in the Quaker tradition, suggested more dramatic and less orthodox action. A recent writer has thus described the methods used after Alice Paul's techniques came to be adopted: "The militants staged massive parades and kept them marching while the women were subjected to obscene insults, spat upon, slapped in the face, tripped up and pelted with burning cigar stubs. Early in 1917, Alice Paul launched her most belligerent effort—the day-after-day picketing of the White House with purple-white-and-gold banners shrilling: Mr President, How Long Must Women Wait for Democracy?"[22]

Negroes, like women, had been exploited, denied human dignity and for many years been kept in a condition of near-servitude. In the fifties of the twentieth century, they decided that they had had enough and in effect asked the same question as the early feminists, How Long Must We Wait for Democracy? They turned to direct nonviolent action, aided and abetted by such legal decisions as that of the Supreme Court declaring, in 1954, that racial segregation in the public schools (a common practice in many States) was a violation of the constitution of the United

States.

By nonviolent direct action they began not merely to undermine the structure of racial injustice but also to develop a sense of self-confidence and dignity. Just as Gandhi found that the Indian masses had first to eliminate their own slavish attitudes before they could effectively oppose imperialism, so Martin Luther King, a leader of the Negro struggle, emphasized destruction of the "Uncle Tom" mentality. He observed: "The nonviolent approach does not immediately change the heart of the oppressor. It first does something to the hearts and souls of those committed to it. It gives them new self-respect; it calls up resources of strength and courage that they did not know they had."[23]

The power of nonviolence to develop a sense of dignity and self confidence as well as to accomplish social results was demonstrated in the Montgomery, Alabama bus boycott of the fifties and in such later examples of nonviolent direct action as freedom rides, sit-ins, wade-ins, and street demonstrations. In the bus boycott, thousands of Negroes walked to work, often over long distances, rather than surrender their objective, the desegregation of buses. In sit-ins, mixed Negro and white groups would deliberately order food in segregated restaurants and, if ill-used physically, would refuse to retaliate in kind. Wade-ins involved similar action in segregated swimming pools. As for freedom rides, groups of Negroes and whites helped break down segregation patterns in buses. Street demonstrations, which were unusually well disciplined considering provocations, sought among other objectives to affect patterns of employment and to secure implementation of and respect for equal opportunity laws already on the statute books.

Although there were many frustrations and full Negro freedom may involve struggles for another generation, nonviolent direct action helped revive the conscience of the United States, provided implementing power for court decisions and statutes, and built up the courage of Negroes for future action. In terms of immediate results, too, it appeared to be effective. Thus the Montgomery bus boycott did break down segregation in the buses of the city; and Martin Luther King tells us that between 1959 and 1961, lunch counters in more than 150 cities were actually desegregated by "sit-in" direct actionists.[24]

The major stream of Negro action, moreover, was animated by principled nonviolence and not merely by expediency. Men like Martin Luther King and Ralph Abernathy were deeply influenced by Gandhi, as well as by their interpretation of Christian teaching. Although King at no point in his life had wondered whether there was validity to the thesis that group action could not or need not abstain from violence, Gandhi's teaching appeared to remove any doubts he may have had.

Negro nonviolence did not lack its challengers, however. Some doubted whether it could be "effective" in the long run. Others frankly thought of it as a mere expediency, at best. It was by no means certain, as this is written, that the exponents of principled nonviolence would continue to occupy the centre of the stage.

Were nonviolence to be repudiated by the American Negro, it would be a sad day for the Negro, for America, and for the world. For the Negro, it would cut off a promising development in mid-stream and almost certainly help frustrate the quest for freedom: repudiation of nonviolence would restore the initiative to segregation leaders and alienate public opinion as well. America as a whole would lose, since the abandonment of nonviolence would probably strengthen the many forces of authoritarianism and militarism undoubtedly present in the United States. Finally, the world would find compromised and clouded the case-studies on the Negro emancipation movement which it might otherwise have used as bases for the development of principled nonviolence elsewhere, especially in international relations.

American Nonviolence and the Future

Thus despite the unfortunately high incidence of violence in American society and culture, there has been an important tradition seeking to counteract it. The religious heritage of nonresistance and nonviolent resistance has provided a focus of reference for theories of nonviolence in general and has also affected the outlooks of major religious bodies; the principle which repudiates coercion of States gives us at least a point of departure for thinking about problems of organization in a hoped-for world community; the absolutist stream in the peace movement reminds us of the all too easy way in which we are accustomed to justify particular wars; American labour, despite its ambivalence, has at least developed much experience with the strike and considerable understanding of the need for nonviolent discipline; and Negro nonviolence has been a marvellous exemplification of satyagraha, a near-model for those seeking to achieve social justice, and a possible basis in experience for the development of a nonviolent national defence.

To the extent, too, that American culture and society have aspired to democracy, however hesitantly, they have exalted the idea of nonviolence; for democracy, it would seem, is the sociopolitical order most compatible with nonviolence both in method and in ends.

Whether nonviolence as a principle will gain in acceptance depends on many factors, but in considerable measure on whether Americans can be convinced that there are more efficacious methods of national defence than military force. Pragmatists as they often tend to be, they must somehow be shown that violence and its threat are "impractical" as well as "immoral"—and for any purpose. They must, moreover, gain a more profound understanding of the implications of the democratic ideals to which most of them are committed and come to see that the defence of democracy by military means—particularly in the modern world—is utterly impossible. In the development of their thinking, they will find her own heritage a source of help.

---

1. Theodore Roosevelt.

2. Matthew V, VI, and VII, in which occur such well-known admonitions as "Resist not evil", "Judge not that ye be not judged", and "Love your enemies".

3. Here Mennonites as well as Lutherans cited Romans XIII, where St Paul admonishes early Christians to "obey the powers that be".

4. Luke XX: 25; Romans XIII: 6, 7.

5. See Guy F. Hershberger, *War, Peace, and Nonresistance* (Scottdale, Pa.: The Herald Press, 1944).

6. One might also note in passing that the Mennonite suspicion of "politics" is very similar to a not untypical general American cultural attitude to the political world.

7. Romans XII: 21.

8. See Isaac Sharpless, *A Quaker Experiment in Government* (Philadelphia: A. J. Ferris, 1898).

9. Letter dated "Monticello, Nov. 16, 1825"; quoted from *Poulson's Daily Advertiser*, Oct. 28, 1826, in *The Friend*, Philadelphia, v. I (1828), p. 104.

10. The argument against coercion of States in federal unions is developed in *The Federalist.*

11. For a detailed account of the theme down to the period following World War I, see Devere Allen, *The Fight for Peace* (New York: Macmillan, 1930).

12. Absolutists frequently cited Sylvester Judd, *The Moral Evils of Our Revolutionary War* (1841).

13. In *The Bigelow Papers.*

14. Much of his pacifist agitation was carried on in his paper, *The Christian Citizen.*

15. C.M. Case, *Nonviolent Coercion* (New York: Century, 1923) and Richard Gregg, *The Power of Nonviolence* (British Ed., London: Routledge, 1938).

16. See Reinhold Niebuhr, *Moral Man and Immoral Society* (N.Y.: Scribner's, 1932).

17. One organization of scientists and technologists deserves special mention: the Society for Social Responsibility in Science, one of whose founders was Albert Einstein, includes many conscientious objectors to all war and encourages its members to work in occupations not connected with the military. It seems to be sympathetic with the absolutist position.

18. *Violence and the Labour Movement* (New York: Macmillan, 1914).

19. *The Dream of Debs* (Chicago: Kerr, 1919).

20. *Individual Liberty* (New York: Vanguard, 1926).

21. Tom Mooney Molders' Defence Committee, Press Service, August 26, 1936.

22. Eric F. Goldman, "Progress—By Moderation *and* Agitation", *N.Y. Times Magazine*, June 18, 1961, p. 5.

23. Martin Luther King, Jr., "Pilgrimage to Nonviolence", *Christian Century*, April 13, 1960, p. 444.

24. Martin Luther King, Jr., "The Time for Freedom Has Come", *N.Y. Times Magazine*, 10 Sept. 1961, p. 119.

SECTION FIVE

THE GANDHIAN APPROACH TO WORLD PEACE

J.B. Kripalani

The problem that faces the world today is not that of individual morality or social behaviour but of intergroup and international behaviour and morals. This problem today has reached such a critical and crucial stage, that either we solve it satisfactorily or we perish as the human race, along with the civilisation that we have created by painful effort and the travail of centuries. Every step in this advance has meant the devoted service of the pioneers, often enough carried through at the expense of their lives.

The problem has, I am afraid, largely been misconceived. It is not one concerned principally with organisation. It is not one of balance of power or of devising checks and balances. It is not one of inspection, complete or limited. It is not even one of organising a World Government, a highly desirable and useful proposal. The problem is primarily moral. Of course, political, social, economic, international issues do arise, and so also those of organisation. But these will not be difficult to tackle successfully if we can solve the fundamental moral problem involved.

Let us for a moment examine the morality that guides groups and nations in their commerce with each other. In all its essentials it is diametrically opposite to the social morality, the observance of which among individuals has made our civilisation possible. What is good in individual and social conduct comes to be bad and undesirable in political and specially in international relations. In social intercourse we admire the man who is peaceful, truthful, modest, and helpful to others. We greatly admire the man who at some personal inconvenience and loss serves his neighbour. However, in the international field we expect nations and their agents to be selfish, proud, overbearing and aggressive. A nation which sacrificed its real or fancied interests for that of a neighbouring nation would be considered foolish and even depraved. In social life we denounce aggression and violence, but the successful use of these is not only not condemned but applauded in the relations between nations. In social life, a murderer pays with his life for his crime, but in international intercourse a politician or a general responsible for arson, loot, rape, mass murder is applauded as a great patriot and a hero. In his honour are erected arches and triumphant marches organised. In social life, individuals are enjoined generally to trust each other and keep their word. No nation ever keeps its word with another nation if it considers that its interests are involved. Nations betraying each other are not the exception but the rule. Even after a war fought to end war, nations who were allied betray each other when the war is over. After World War II, nations whose territories were invaded and occupied by the armies of Hitler and who organised inside and outside their country resistance movements and helped the Allies to win the war, were enslaved. If some of them have escaped this fate they have done so by the skin of their teeth. A nation which trusts another would be lost. India accepted Chinese professions of friendship and the result is wanton aggression, the end of which nobody can see today. Nations in their dealings with each other, however polite their mode of address, are proud and touchy and resent every real or fancied insult. In social life we are prepared to give and take, for the sake of compromise and for accommodating the other's point of view.

Unless, therefore, the collective mind of groups and nations is civilised there can be no peace in the world. Rather, the very social advance that man has made so far will be destroyed. This is so with every armed conflict. Instruments of destruction get ever sharper until now they have arrived at the nuclear stage. Even then the tests must continue. One wonders what more is possibly wanted, when several nations already have with them the instruments which can destroy the whole of humanity over and over again.

It was not an international problem of the present intensity that confronted Gandhi. However, the moral quality of the problem, though not to the present degree, was the same. How did he try to tackle it? He saw that human life is one and cannot be divided into different compartments, social, economic, political and international. Therefore he sought the solution of its troubles on a moral and ideological plane. He held that the same rules of morality that guide individuals in their social conduct must also guide groups and nations in their mutual intercourse. It should be as immoral and sinful for nations to cheat, deceive and injure each other as it is for individuals to do so in their civil life. Murder does not cease to be a crime and a sin if it is committed in the interest of the self, the family or the nation. It must be remembered that the nation is only a big family. If an administrator cannot take bribes to support his family, he cannot also engage in acts of doubtful morality to serve what he considers would be in the best interests of the nation. Evil is evil, whatever the apparent interest served. Means, as in civil life, must not be subordinated to the ends, which should be pure, whether for individuals, groups or nations. There must be only one conscience, the same for the group and the nation as for the individual. The dichotomy between individual and collective morality results in creating split personalities. Collective immorality is bound to poison the moral springs of the individual. Moral man cannot live in an immoral or non-moral international order, without impairing his higher nature. Gandhi believed that every action, whether performed for self, family, group or nation, must produce its own appropriate result, karma. Evil actions create evil karma. In the international field this evil karma seems to have overtaken the world today. Every previous war has been the cause of a subsequent conflict. World War I was the cause of World War II. It was caused by the unbalance produced by World War I. The Cold War of today is the result of the cruelties and injustices practised during the Second World War. If it flares up into a hot World War III, it would be due to the karma created by the two previous world wars. There is no escape from the law of karma. As an individual sows, so must he reap. As a nation sows so must it reap. It cannot sow thistles and reap mangoes. The vicious circle that has been created by ever recurring wars in human society can only be broken when nations refuse to play the international game with the same loaded dice of war and violence. Gandhi has said: "You cannot successfully fight them with their weapon. After all you cannot go beyond the atom bomb. Unless we have a new way of fighting imperialism of all brands in place of the outworn one of violent resistance there is no hope for the oppressed races of the earth."

In consonance with the spirit of the sages, prophets, reformers and pioneers of old, Gandhi prescribed moral means for the settlement of international disputes. It is true that his canvas was limited. It was confined to two nations, India and Britian. But he held that the independence of India could be achieved through truth and nonviolence and when so achieved it would be real independence. In such a struggle no residue of evil karma, of violence and deceit will be left behind, to be paid for afterwards, as is the case with war. Though in India it was fundamentally a dispute between one nation and another, there was no question of any bilateral restraints. Indians could not return violence for violence. They had to do the right thing because it was right, because in the words of the *Gita* it was kartavya-karma, because it was one's duty. However, Gandhi had also the faith that when there is right action right results must follow, right not as the individual in his partial knowledge sees but right in the total scheme of things. "The doer of good can never come to evil", as the *Gita* says.

There is another aspect of Gandhi's thought about international intercourse which we must note. His idea of Indian independence was different from the usual historical idea of it. Like every fighter for national independence he loved freedom. It was something good in itself, something that every nation should have. But Gandhi's conception of a nation's freedom was different from the usual one. He wanted the freedom of India not only for the sake of his country, but for the good of humanity and for its service. As an individual must sacrifice himself for the nation when necessary so also must a nation be prepared to sacrifice itself for humanity. As I have already said, organised nations came to develop a personality. This personality, as in the case of the individual, must be subject to the moral law. Moral law often involves martyrdom. The nation as a person, if it must follow the moral law, must also be prepared for martyrdom for the sake of humanity. Martyrdom, as in the case of the individual pioneer and renovator, may or may not come but a nation, if it is to be moral, must be prepared for it. Gandhi said: "I want the freedom of my country so that other countries may learn something from my free country, so that the resources of my country might be utilized for the benefit of mankind. Just as the call of patriotism teaches us today that the individual has to die for the family, the family has to die for the village, the village for the district, the district for the province, the province for the country, even so a country has to be free in order that it may die if necessary for the benefit of the world. My love, therefore, of nationalism or my idea of nationalism, is that my country may become free, that if need be the whole country may die, so that the human race may live."

During the last World War Gandhi advised England not to fight Hitler with arms. He said that the result would be that Hitler's armies would march into England. He would allow them to march in but there should be perfect non-cooperation with them from every Englishman. No Englishman should have dealings with the occupying forces. He believed that when a whole population non-cooperates it will be impossible for a conquering force to occupy the conquered territory for long. For this he wanted people to train themselves in individual civil resistance.

I need not go into the details of the training he prescribed for individual nonviolent resisters, satyagrahis. But Gandhi did contemplate such contingencies as when conquering armies would be on the march. As things are today, his strategy will be the best even for violent fighters. An army marching into a foreign territory which it wants to occupy cannot be resisted today if it is backed with nuclear weapons. The only possibility of resistance in such cases is guerrilla warfare. Resisting armies can be demoralised by a single nuclear bomb. But separate individuals, working from innumerable centres, cannot be so demoralised. If this today is the only strategy left for violent national freedom fighters against a Hitlerian marching army supported by nuclear war-heads then surely such an individual non-violent guerrilla warfare is not quite such a fanciful idea as it would at first sight appear.

If humanity, then, is serious about avoiding the possibility of nuclear destruction, nations must be prepared first to regulate their mutual intercourse, as individuals do in civil life, by observing the rules of the moral law. As many pioneering reformers and prophets had to suffer in the cause of establishing the moral law in civil life, so some nation or nations must be prepared to suffer for the establishment of the moral law among nations. If Gandhi would have been alive today, he would have wanted and advised the Indian nation to dispense with its fighting forces whatever the consequences. He would have advised that this question of India's disarmament should be irrespective of what others did or did not. If it was good, it must be done irrespective of consequences. He had the faith to believe that India making such a sacrifice could never die. But even if physical extinction was the result it would be welcome in the service of humanity. In this mortal world everything, every individual, every institution, is subject to time, kala, death. The only thing that one can aspire for is a glorious death in a good cause. More than this nobody can expect or wish for. It is therefore that I said at the beginning that the question before us as national entities is a moral one and not merely external or organisational.

It may be said, But who is to bell the cat? Has any government the right to require such a stupendous national sacrifice? Martyrdom for a whole people? This question is asked as if the same kind of sacrifice is not asked for by governments from their people when they call them to arms! The political leaders of all countries have always compelled people to take the risks of war. But when it comes to the question of taking risks in the cause of peace, which after all are fewer as evidenced by India's struggle, they take refuge behind the people's will. The leaders have never, even in democracies, taken the people into their confidence when declaring war. It is governments that decide the questions of peace and war.

But it may be asked, Can a nation be educated in nonviolence? The education of a nation into a new ideology or morality does not consist in each member of the nation being educated separately. There are no schools and colleges where national ideologies and moralities can be learnt. Even in physical warfare most of the fighting is learnt during the war or there would be no universal military service. The very acceptance of a new idea by the leadership makes for rapid public education. For his new weapon of nonviolent resistance Gandhi did not open educational institutions. He took great pains in educating the leaders. The conversion of the public then was easy. Also knowledge of a new technique improves with its practice. Even when soldiers are educated in military colleges their military education takes place on the battlefield. Every war uses new and untried instruments and strategy. Nor is every soldier in the army a brave and courageous man. He may be a veritable coward but under proper leadership and discipline he too can give a good account of himself. He would disdain to desert his colours, because this is a thing not done in the army. This is the rule. Exceptions to this rule are few and far between.

It is plain today that if the leaders of countries carrying on nuclear tests abandoned them, the common people will not rebel. If the leaders of the countries which possess nuclear stockpiles decide to destroy them, the people will not resist. Even if some nation took, in this respect, unilateral action there will be no revolt. Rather people may take pride in such a step being taken by their nation.

In this connection Gandhi says: "If the recognised leaders of mankind, who have control over the engines of destruction, were wholly to renounce their use, with full knowledge of its implications, permanent peace can be obtained. This is clearly impossible without the Great Powers of the earth renouncing their imperialistic designs. This again seems impossible without great nations ceasing to believe in soul-destroying competition and to desire to multiply wants and, therefore, increase their material possessions."

However, the condition is that the leaders should have a burning faith in nonviolent resistance. It must be nothing put-on or dramatic. It must be the genuine stuff. It must be a belief that will stand all pressure. If need be, the leaders must be prepared to give up power and office in the pursuit of their ideal. Such a belief, Gandhi held, can come only from a belief in God. But for Gandhi God and the moral law were synonymous. He said that Truth is God. He held that there is no difference between the law and the Law-giver. A person who observed the moral law, whether he believed in a God as popularly conceived or not, according to Gandhi had a spiritual belief. This is necessary because without faith nothing great can be done. It is faith which makes people believe that ultimately victory will be with them. Even if there is defeat it will be good with them.

When the battle for nonviolence in international relations is won, it will not be difficult to devise institutional measures to check anti-social nations. But first the victory must be won on the moral and spiritual plane. Why did the League of Nations fail? It failed because the leaders of the member nations had not reformed their minds and purified their hearts. They believed in aggression, conquest and exploitation of weaker peoples. So long as this is the case any organisational devices will break down at critical moments.

THE GRASS-ROOTS OF WORLD PEACE

G. Ramachandran

It is impossible to believe in the sanctity or in the ultimate validity of nationalism. I think nationalism and what are called Nation States have become largely menaces to the human spirit and to human society. Perhaps in Europe and America there are more mature countries which are willing to go beyond the frontiers of Nation States. But here in Asia, with the newly awakened nationhood of many of its peoples, we are in the grip of nationalism and we are proud of our new Nation States. The European and American peoples are at a great advantage in comparison with the people of India because they can think a little more quickly than we can of the world as a whole; we are much more concerned with the problems inside our own country. But we need not go all the way of the European and American countries to learn the lessons that they have learnt. We should be able to learn from history. I do not believe that these powerful Nation States and their governments will ever make the peace of the world. By their very structure and composition, by the very inner law of their being, I think they are incapable of making the peace of the world. The collapse of Summit Meetings in recent years is no accident. It is inevitable in the history of today. I do not think any Summit will make the peace of the world. It is the base, the common people, that will have to make the peace. I simply cannot understand how anyone can imagine that half a dozen people meeting somewhere in the name of countless millions of people can make the peace of the world.

Some day little groups, meeting in tens of thousands of places in the world, standing for peace, federating together and creating a people's movement might make the peace of the world. So I am, so far as I can think about it today, a sceptic and I cannot bring myself to believe that big and powerful Nation States are going to make the peace of the world. I think they will not. What then can we do? I foresee that the next great step in peace-making in the world would be for the peoples to turn their faces towards their own governments. No government is standing for peace as we understand peace, not even the Indian Government. The Indian Government is as much armed as any other government, consistent with its resources. If it had more resources, there will be more and bigger arms. Each one of us in our own country must create a people's movement against the attitudes of governments which consider that war is still a method for settling any problem in the world. This is treading on dangerous ground; this cuts across what is called patriotism and nationalism. I think the peace-makers of the world must get beyond patriotism and nationalism. Man is one. Humanity is one and we are citizens of one world. This is a very difficult concept. But unless we reach up to that level some day, peace-making will remain a pious dream. If we let our own governments commit our people to war, then where are we? One remembers with gratitude the work that is being done by the peace workers, by those who want to abolish nuclear warfare totally, in England, the United States, and other countries. I wonder if in India we have done even that much to turn our faces towards our own government and to say that we give them no moral right to commit our people to war, for any purpose whatsoever, because we are convinced that war is a total evil. If there is any shadow of a doubt anywhere in our minds, that after all war can do some good, then we destroy our creed. We then commit moral and spiritual suicide within ourselves in regard to this basic problem of world peace. So maybe, if we are treading this path, which is sharp as a razor's edge, we shall some day have to come in conflict with our own national governments everywhere, refusing them the moral right to commit our peoples to war for any reason or purpose.

But we must remember that the war-makers of the world are a powerful community. They have tremendous material resources at their command, and even the psychological resources for awakening the passions of patriotism and nationalism and working people into a kind of fury against some enemy State. Against that, what have we but our conviction and our faith and our dedication? On the other hand, it is unfortunate that the peacemakers of the world are themselves divided. There has come about a kind of broad division in peace-making, two camps of peace-making. One suspects the other. I think this is not morally right, nor is it good peace strategy. Peace-making is the monopoly of no party, no country, no group in the world. Peace has become today such a terrific and emergent need for bare survival that whoever asks for peace is a friend and an ally. We must not divide the forces of peace-making in the world. We may be as cautious as you like, as circumspect about it as you like, refusing to be taken in by every kind of pretension, but let us not cut the peace-forces of the world into sharp and hostile divisions, glaring at each other, so that peace-makers themselves create a new kind of conflict in the world over the issue of peace. If we do that, we shall weaken ourselves. With open eyes, with open minds, and certainly with clear convictions, we should be able to close our ranks all over the world. All parties, groups and peoples deliberately standing for peace, whatever be the reason, must unite.

Dr Radhakrishnan, the great Indian philosopher-statesman, has said that the cold war is in some ways even more dangerous than the hot war. The cold war corrodes men's souls and prepares for the destruction of their bodies. We now see signs of it in our own country, in this country of Gandhi and Vinoba—cold war between Pakistan and India, and between China and India. Maybe, if somebody works up our passions, we in India are as much prone to cold war and hot war as any other people in the world. Maybe the heritage which has come from Gandhi and the inspiration which today comes from Vinoba may help us a little to stand on firm ground. But one has yet to see how far and how long these influences can succeed with the same kind of human material in this country as exists in every other country. We must nevertheless not become parties in any sense to the cold war.

There has been some criticism that Indian peace-workers look at European and American peace-workers and say they are not doing enough constructive work. I think we have outlived such a view now. We have realised that European and American and other peace-workers do a lot of constructive work along their own lines. Having said that, I do not hesitate to say that all of us peace-workers all over the world are not doing sufficient day-to-day work which alone can lead to the peace of the world. Peace-making begins from the roots of life, it is not something that merely flowers at the top. How we order our economic life together is part of peace-making. You cannot have an exploiting society building for peace. You cannot evade the issue of injustice and then talk of peace. I think peace without justice will be a complete fraud. Gandhi used prophetic words. He said he did not want "the peace of the grave-yard". It is easy to have the peace of the grave-yard. If we are thinking of the peace of human beings living together, on terms of equal rights and privileges and sharing everything justly together, then our present society has to be completely transformed before it can become the crucible which can hold the fiery lava of the peace which lives and throbs in the hearts of men and women. We want a radical change of social conditions effected peacefully. Here again is a challenge to each one of us peace-workers in our own countries. As we go back to our work, let us look at the society in which we live, discover the roots of injustice and apply non-violent pressure to pluck them out. Every little nonviolent struggle to turn injustice into justice is a token for peace. If we do that we gather more strength, more unity, and we grow towards a just and lasting world peace.

Somebody once asked me, "What do you think was the greatest thing that came from Mahatma Gandhi?" and a few friends who were sitting with me thought at once that I would mouth the word "nonviolence". I did not. I said the greatest thing that came from Gandhi was his challenge that we must act here and now, for justice, wherever we are. You may put on handspun cloth, you may carry out all the hundred and one commandments of the Gandhian creed, but if when you saw injustice you evaded its challenge, then you have commited moral and spiritual suicide. To evade an issue is to run away from truth and therefore from the whole possibility of nonviolence. The greatest thing about Gandhi was his teaching and example that we must act here and now to bring about justice, and then immediately, of course, followed the next teaching that all action must be nonviolent. The essential thing for Gandhi was that there must be action and no evasion of a challenge. To Gandhi inaction was violence.

Gandhi has sometimes been misinterpreted in certain Pacifist and Quaker circles. For instance, once Gandhi did say if the only choice before him was between violence and cowardice he would advice violence. This indicates no preference at all for violence. If you knew the life of Gandhi, the basic teaching of Gandhi, the whole work of Gandhi, this would fit like a perfect piece into what he stood for. Action was first with him, but with the inevitable corollary that all action must be nonviolent, because every other action was self-defeating. I think unless we understand this about Gandhi, we do not understand Gandhi at all. Act now, act today, act here, act in the present living moment when there is an issue facing you. If you turn your face away from the issue mouthing big words, and maybe even following all the other virtues, then you betray nonviolence. You will then stand naked before your Maker as somebody who has committed moral and spiritual suicide.

We are fond of talking about unilateral disarmament. The Indian says to the Englishman, you are the fittest for unilateral disarmament and the Englishman turns round and says to the Indian, you are from the country of Gandhi and Vinoba and so you start the game. I think not one of us has the right to ask anybody else to unilaterally disarm. If we are not prepared to do it, let us at least keep our mouths shut and not ask other people to do this. We can unilaterally disarm only ourselves.

Then we come to the Shanti-Sena. This is the most positive thing which emerges from the whole of this background. The usual argument is—I have heard this even from people who are dedicated to nonviolence—that we have not built up the Shanti-Sena, that we have not yet organised the people for nonviolent action (they don't say how long it will take) and so, in the mean time, if there is aggression what can we do except meet it in the traditional military way. I think when we say this, we completely give up the case for nonviolence. Anyone wishing to defend his country violently against a violent aggression is taking a tremendous risk today. Now take India. Can India stand a real great attack from one of the major powers? Our defence will crumble in a few days against a major onslaught of a major power. Even as between the most powerful States, defence is now a mockery. You can only destroy, you cannot defend.

Now in such a world, to take recourse to violent defence under the plea that we are not yet fully prepared for nonviolence is to make nonsense of nonviolence. If you are not prepared today, you are not going to be prepared tomorrow. You must take risks in this tremendous venture of faith here and now. Gandhi was willing to take the risk. You may say there is no Gandhi in India today. I know there is no Gandhi. But why cut at the roots of Gandhi which are still with us? No man is too small, no man is too disorganised, no man is too weak to put his faith in God and in himself and to say, "I believe in nonviolence and will take a risk here and now". My thesis, in brief, is that no country today will run greater risks by accepting nonviolence than by turning to violence for self-protection.

IS THERE A NONVIOLENT ROAD TO A PEACEFUL WORLD?

Wilfred Wellock

In facing this problem it is necessary to get down to its roots, and the first fact to emphasise is that war is an expression of bad human relationships, whereas peace expresses the tranquility of harmonious human relationships. Hence the difference between war and peace is the difference between a knowledge and a lack of knowledge of the art of living and the conditions of personal and social wholeness, of physical, moral and spiritual health. The art of living includes stern discipline in obeying the commands of Truth.

Failures in human conduct there will always be in the very nature of things, but what is important is that such aberrations be prevented from spreading by means of social vigilance and a powerful social awareness of vital social values and standards of behaviour. There should be ample institutional means of insuring these in every society. Eternal vigilance is still and always will be the fundamental law of moral and spiritual health and of social progress.

Today, however, we are confronted with a wave of materialism that is sweeping across the world like a hurricane, in spite of professed religions and politics. In every country spiritual values are declining and moral standards weakening under the pressure of growing appetites and demands for all manner of excitements and self-indulgences. Throughout the West the prevailing aim of governments, political parties, and the public generally is maximum incomes and maximum production and consumption of goods and services. The outcome is a persistent demand for higher incomes, more markets for bigger exports of goods in order to import large quantities of food, raw materials and luxuries, increasing social tensions at home, and dangerous international tensions arising from the intensive competition of an ever-increasing number of "devouring" nations for markets and supplies.

In this situation it is idle to think in terms of a short cut to world peace. No conceivable peace conference could now take one firm, fundamental step towards that goal. The whole world lives in fear of a nuclear war, while a vast network of vicious international relationships holds the nations in the grip of mutual fear under the burden of mounting armaments. These are the realities behind the issue of peace and war today, and from them governments flinch as before a plague.

The two primary forces that are determining the course of events within and between the nations today are fear and greed, and to a large extent the fear is the product of greed.

The main cause of the changes that have led to the extension of the greed principle to its present dimensions, was the Industrial Revolution which took root some two centuries ago, in Britain. The building of factories fitted out with mechanisms where people were called upon to work various stipulated hours, for wages dictated by the owners, later called capitalists, was an innovation in production. It enabled an employer to live on the labour of his fellows, even sumptuously, and to give his family a good education and privileges which to the factory workers seemed fabulous.

From these simple beginnings sprang the powerful industrial states of today. In their wake came endless problems and all manner of proposed solutions. Among the latter were trade unions and political parties, Labour, Socialist, Anarchist and Communist, all of which were fighting instruments aimed at freeing the workers from the injustices and exploitations of capitalism. As already stated, the greed principle expressed itself in competition for world markets and supplies and also for the capture and exploitation of Colonial territories, which together ultimately led to the first world war, which also gave birth to Communist Russia. There followed the Treaty of Versailles which hurled Germany into complete bankruptcy, whence came Hitler and Nazism and ultimately the second world war.

But, as always when power becomes tyranny, there comes a day of reckoning. The logic of these shattering events penetrated into the millions of working-class minds in every Western country. Why, they asked, should all these evil things happen in a "Christian" country? The churches supported the two world wars, and have always supported capitalism with all its class divisions and antagonisms. What, then, is the church's defence? Is religion played out? The answer came in empty churches. Orthodox Christianity lost its power and its leadership. The worker turned away, devoid of all spiritual guides, since no other religion, culture or philosophy was at hand. Thus deserted the common people gradually accepted the materialistic values of capitalism.

The consequences are before us. Today the workers of all classes, also the professions, including teachers, doctors, lawyers, scientists and at last civil servants are waging a gigantic social conflict for bigger shares of the national cake, to some extent against one another, and all against the Government.

One result has been a catastrophic lowering of moral standards. What wins money is justified. Gambling and all games of chance formerly under the condemnation of an almost universal conscience are now almost as universally accepted, openly and without shame or compunction, while the clamour for money as profit or wages or what, is breaking down the barricades of probity and honesty at an appalling rate.

In consequence, politics are becoming increasingly suspect. Even the labour and socialist movement has largely lost its soul, most of it having become middle class.

So far as the West is concerned, we have thus reached the era of a triumphant materialism. Today that materialism and the economic and social trends out of which it sprang, are extending their tentacles to the ends of the earth. They have gripped Japan, are penetrating into India and are now entering

Africa.

Thus the time has come for the whole world to face the bleak realities of our time, especially the fact that over the last few decades the condition of man has markedly deteriorated. His future is threatened by two major evils: a war of extermination and the persistent and growing tendency towards the centralisation of industrial, financial and political power in the hands of tycoons and small coteries of politicians and others well entrenched in social and titled power.

There is no time to lose. The latest targets of armaments expansion indicated by the two Dinosaurs, register the supremacy and the impasse of economic and military power in the modern world. The high percentage of their total wealth which this expenditure consumes, indicates the magnitude of their fear, which is a demoralising and spiritually destructive force. Yet neither Dinosaur acknowledges a limit to such power or the necessity of setting a limit to its accumulation, although there exists a law which cannot be transgressed with impunity—the law of human limitation, or frailty. Once the concept of human wholeness vanishes the time soon comes when living ceases to be worth the candle.

That point is now being reached in the West, despite the heightening glamour and frenzy of perpetual excitement, self-indulgence and riotous living. Already behind the facade of a commercialised, vulgarised way of life one may feel the throb of a deep depression, perceive the shadows of harassing doubt and even a longing for the sweet fresh air of a simple, wholesome life.

The megatons multiply, but depressed imaginations refuse to face the magnitude of their menace, whence wide sections of the public barely move a muscle when informed that megatons are now assembled that could wipe out entire continents in the space of a few minutes. The grim fact is that the fear of living is becoming as frightening as was once the fear of death. Life has become so cheap that the gulf between it and death has almost vanished. Death having lost its sting, the grave spells freedom to an ever-increasing extent.

All this was bound to happen when the cash values of capitalism began to descend to the bottom of the social ladder. Today at every social level the paramount passion is to raise its allocation of the national income, whence politics have degenerated into a dog-fight for better shares of it.

Thus the idealism of fifty years ago—Christian, socialist, or what—has vanished, as has the concept of an equal society, leaving behind the dead weight of a rabid materialism that is obliterating the last vestiges of once highly esteemed spiritual values.

In this very serious situation I would make three submissions: First, that the foregoing material provides the background against which every effective instrument in the fight for world peace must be tested. Second, that no peace policy can succeed in the midst of the prevailing and growing materialism and all the anti-social activities and institutions to which it has given rise. Third, that the emergence of a peaceful world must follow a two-sided revolution in which both sides operate simultaneously, namely, a widespread personal resistance to war and all nuclear armaments, unilaterally, and a social and industrial decentralisation and fulfilling the right of every person to responsibility, creative self-expression and the spiritual values of cooperative participation in the running of industry.

War and violence are obviously played out and must be totally abandoned if civilisation is to survive. The only civilisation that can survive the storms and conflicts that are inseparable from the aggressive societies of today must rest on whole persons, and thus on a culture and way of life which can produce them. Peace is not a sacred symbol which sits on top of a civilisation like a gilded God, but a way of life which must be supported by society's major institutions—cultural, industrial, religious. Gandhi was one of the first to see the full significance of that truth, and to recognise the importance of developing India, both industrially and culturally, on very different lines from those now operating in the West.

During his later years Gandhi gave much thought to the problem of human wholeness and its achievement. He concentrated on two integral institutions, industry and education. His inquiries in England during his student days had convinced him that India would make a tragic mistake if she copied Western industrial methods. He deplored the very thought of India transforming men into machines as was happening in the West. He preferred a slower, more wholesome growth. Let there be mechanisms, so long as they assist the craftsman by taking out donkey work, but they must not be allowed to rob the craftsman of the right to responsibility in industry, to self-expression, and to the human values of cooperative working for common ends. He saw in India, with its 500,000 villages, a great opportunity of erecting a quite new kind of village democracy. In every village there would be agriculture, and a number of small industries. These would start with hand tools, but the workers would use their brains, study Western tools and methods and then select their own tools and mechanism with a view to high quality production and its satisfactions. The entire village economy would be developed stage by stage as meditation and experience determined. To meet the needs of this industrial and social pattern he evolved his system of Basic Education, which seeks to balance book learning and theoretical instruction with creative hand labour. In India I myself have witnessed small girls of six, spinning cotton in school while joyfully singing their spinning song. The system expresses the harmony of knowing, doing and being. It was first adopted in small village schools but it now runs right through to the university. This concept that education, industry and community self-government are all aspects of a process of producing whole persons reveals Gandhi's means of building a peaceful society in India, and throughout the world.

Obviously the highly industrialised and centralised West cannot copy Gandhi's pattern. It must therefore find another way of reaching the same goal. The basic principles involved in the Gandhian vision are unassailable. They include the universal right to responsibility, to creative self-expression and to the human values of cooperation, in one's daily labour. These rights demand the culture of small communities as the necessary basis of a valid democracy. Just how fast we can move towards industrial decentralisation cannot now be said. Obviously the start must be made with the small industries.

It is thus imperative that we of the West begin to think in terms of inaugurating a new creative era in which quantity yields to quality, abundance to sufficiency, complexity to simplicity, haste to meditation, fashion to individuality, limitation to character, mental fragmentation to spiritual wholeness, satiation to satisfaction and cash to culture.

Traditionally in most of Western Europe education meant the culture of the whole person, not only in private schools and universities, but in apprenticeship. Practically all the old craft Guilds stipulated in their list of principles that a master craftsman must prepare his apprentices for whole living, including his habits and morals generally. In some cases he had to teach them a foreign language, usually French, in order that when they had completed their apprenticeship as builder, wood craftsman, painter, etc. they might travel across Europe to study the works of the great masters in France, Belgium, Holland, Italy, etc., and as the Guilds had close relationships with the Church, their members were given free hospitality in the monasteries, of which there were many thousands enroute from London to Rome.

Happily there are many signs of the disquiet on the part of lone thinkers and small groups concerning present trends, in most countries, and numerous outspoken protests against 'some of the more sinister trends are being made. Indeed I could fill several pages with a brief account of them. Many community business enterprises are functioning in many European countries, while not a few private business concerns are endeavouring to cultivate a team spirit by various means which involve some degree of sacrifice of profits. An organisation has appeared in Britain under the name of "Demintry" which preaches and practises the decentralisation of at least a percentage of the capital of a business. One of these concerns describes itself as a "Commonwealth", another as an "industrial community". The verdict of these experiments is "*Satisfaction all round*". They have definitely proved that co-ownership is a valid business principle both financially and spiritually, having revolutionised human relationships and developed a sense of unity of purpose. One of these firms allocates, by general agreement, 20 per cent of its profits to its workers, and a like sum, again with common consent, to a wide variety of public causes, local, national and international, thus establishing vital connections with its own locality, with the nation and with the wider world.

The case for co-ownership is strong. Labour is a vital factor in production, but it could be infinitely more vital and fruitful under co-ownership. Money is invested in machines, then why not in human beings who possess power which if appealed to in a just and human way could improve output enormously both in quantity and quality. The greatest crime of capitalism has been its rejection of the vast reservoir of creative power and enthusiasm by regarding its workers as machines rather than as persons whose natural instincts and impulses crave for self-expression. The means must be found of reawakening and using their long ignored finer powers.

Moreover current financial operations strongly vindicate the demand for co-ownership. During the last few decades enormous profits from most of our productive and distribution business have been handed out to shareholders for which they did nothing more than sign receipts, whereas in strict justice a considerable percentage of it should have been returned to the public in lower prices and to the workers in higher wages or as co-ownership capital.

The important fact is that the industrial revolution on behalf of human wholeness has begun. The task now is to extend it in every possible way. It is for the workers in the smaller industries to take the lead in agitating for co-ownership, and as far as possible with the backing of their trades unions. Only a little success is needed to open the way to what might become a general awakening and a powerful swing towards a creative democracy. Advancement in the main industries will help to point the way to the decentralisation of the giant industries.

In the West the public protests against the production and use of nuclear arms have had spectacular results, yet they have only touched the fringe of public opinion. It is my conviction that in a period of social decay like the present they will not succeed in their ultimate purpose without the inspiration of a constructive social revolution. It is in simultaneous direct action on both these fronts that I see the only hope of moving towards a free humanity and a peaceful world.

NUCLEAR EXPLOSIONS AND WORLD PEACE

Horace Alexander

The present age is faced with a dilemma in the world of power politics which it may fairly be claimed is new: either the great nations of the world must honestly agree to renounce the use of the newest type of weapon, or the world will speedily be brought to an end. Hitherto, however drunk with power some world conqueror might become, he could only scourge half a continent at the most; and normally, after the armies had passed, the peasants who remained alive would soon begin to rebuild their huts, replough their fields, and rebuild the foundations of civilized life. Indeed, as Gandhi long ago pointed out, if the history of man had really consisted, as the history books too often suggest, of the deeds of emperors and war lords only, mankind would long ago have perished. Happily, the truth has always been that the vast majority of human beings have lived peaceably with their neighbours, and have gone on quietly producing food and other necessities for life with little regard to the misdeeds of their rulers.

Today this is no longer the situation. Unless the rulers of the world learn to restrain their use of power, unless the poison of power can somehow be eradicated from the texture of the great Nation State of our time, mankind is almost certainly doomed to perish, and to destroy this beautiful earth, with its inhabitants, trees and flowers, animals, birds and fishes, and all.

The philosopher, duly instructed in modern astronomical knowledge, may say: What does it matter, from the angle of eternity, whether life on one tiny satellite of one little star disappears into oblivion? Will there not still be millions of stars and planets left? But such an attitude will hardly appeal to the ordinary man. This earth, and this earth alone, is the home of the human species as we know him. Apparently millions of years have been spent in bringing the earth to its present state of development. The cultural achievements of man even in the past few centuries of that vast story are such that every decent-minded human being must wish to pass them on, enriched if possible, to unborn generations for centuries to come. Perhaps the most horrible blasphemy of all is to suggest that perhaps it is now "God's will" that the world should come to an end. Whatever else may be said about human folly, let not man accuse God of making him a fool. In this whole discussion, perhaps it is better to leave theology out.

Of course this does not mean that the issue facing the human race can be decided without some ultimate sense of values. Indeed, it is just here that we are in the greatest difficulty. Gandhi's life-task consisted in the effort to apply the moral law to politics. He refused to believe in the ordinary laws of political expediency. In particular, it was his conviction that the Nation State should rely no longer on military force for its defence, but that it should have the courage to disarm, even if necessary in the face of threats of armed invasion from its neighbours. But at the same time he was a realist. He knew that in fact neither the people of India nor the people of any other modern State had today the immense moral courage to follow this bold line. The vast majority of thinking citizens of every State believes that it is a vital necessity to keep up armed forces adequate for "defence". And as it is futile to rely on armament that is out of date, this today comes very near to saying: "We (Indians, Pakistanis, French, Germans, Japanese, whom you will) must have the latest nuclear bombs at our disposal; otherwise, the 'enemy' will suddenly overwhelm us". So we are back at our dilemma. Either we all agree to renounce these weapons, or we all go on making them, till someone starts the shooting, and the world ends in a mass of deadness.

Is there any way out? It must be confessed that the outlook is extremely gloomy. Deep mutual distrust still separates the nations of the world. The Americans do not believe that the Russians can ever be trusted to keep their promises, nor the Russians the Americans. The same, I think, is generally true as between Indians and Pakistanis; perhaps as between French and Germans, and so on. So what hope is there?

Some of our statesmen assure us that the chief hope comes from fear. All the statesmen today know that once the nuclear explosions begin, ruin is almost inevitable for every country, including even the one that begins the bombing. Therefore, no statesman really wants war. This is perhaps an advance from only twenty-five years ago when Hitler, for example, almost certainly wanted to wage a war of revenge, and would have felt himself cheated if he had got what he wanted without war. Of course, he calculated that he was bound to win. He was wrong, but only just wrong.

Today, it would be rasher than ever for a powerful statesman to assume that his country would win. So, up to a point, fear is doubtless a deterrent on reckless policies. But as I write, the great powers still seem to be following their policies of "brinkmanship" that is, of pressing their opponent as hard as possible, under threat of letting loose the bombers if he does not give way, so that one wonders how long human endurance, on the part of innumerable young airmen poised for instant action, to say nothing of their exhausted chiefs, endlessly negotiating for ends that are for ever as far away as the carrot suspended in front of the donkey's nose, can continue. Within another few years, surely there will be a catastrophe unless this unbearable tension is somehow relaxed. But how?

Philip Noel-Baker, in his remarkable book *The Arms Race*, has demonstrated that the powers have, within recent years, come near to a general agreement on disarmament, in spite of all the technical details. The failure has been due, not to technical difficulties, but to political considerations. His conclusion is that if, in every land, hundreds of dedicated men and women will de-vote themselves to the task of pressing for an agreed disarmament, the governments will be obliged to make the agreements that have been so near and yet so far. At least, one may urge that citizens of the world who care for world peace should try to instruct themselves on what has happened, and continue to press their Government to show greater courage.

Another type of action that is at least getting some attention from press and public is typified by the so-called Aldermaston marches in England. Those who take part in these marches are all dedicated to the conviction that it would be right for Britain to renounce the nuclear bombings absolutely, and to stop the manufacture of bombs without waiting for any international agreement, and to face the possible consequences, however disastrous from the point of view of national survival, without fear. This is, in fact, an appeal to the very opposite of fear, an appeal to what Gandhi called the *matchless power of truth.*

I have not been able to participate in these marches; but those who have done so, including some middle-aged men and women who are not, I am sure, carried away by easy heady enthusiasm, have found them profoundly stimulating and hopeful; and the response of the public has been more and more positive. It may well be that less than one per cent of the population of England is directly affected by such action. But the *spiritual forces of mankind have little relation to numbers or democratic majorities.* If a mighty force is being engendered it will begin to influence the whole national mind, spreading hope and confidence and courage in the place of apathy, indifference, fear and despair.

I do not expect that these actions of a small minority, however dedicated, will suddenly lead the British Government to announce its determination to stop all nuclear preparations. Its effect is likely to be much less spectacular; but perhaps, in the end, even more profound.

So long as it is tacitly assumed on every side that the only things that finally count in human affairs, even in world politics, are military and economic might, there is little hope for mankind. Gandhi believed, and tried to demonstrate in his whole life, that the *power of the human spirit is mightier than the power of* *any bomb.* The right use of both reason and conviction can turn the world from suicide to a new era of fruitful cooperation. If we have faith that in the hearts of all peoples everywhere, whether they are Russians or Chinese or Pakistanis or Americans, whether they are statesmen or financiers or ordinary men and women, there is an essential element of goodness, which can be released if they see that their neighbours have faith in them, then there is still hope that mankind can find the way to paths of peace and goodwill.

THE GANDHIAN WAY AND NUCLEAR WAR

P. T. Raju

This is a subject in which almost every one who has heard about Hiroshima is interested and about which very many are worried. What I can say and wish to say on the subject is known to, and can be said by, many. But they may not say it in the way I do. All can infer that Gandhi would say that there should be no nuclear war and that all nuclear weapons should be banned; but he would go further and say that all war should be banned, and would go still further and say that all forms of violence should be banned. When we think about nuclear war, we think about a dreadful reality, a possibility that was made actual, not by the promptings of the good will in man, but by those of his evil will. The solution of how to prevent nuclear war cannot, therefore, be given in more idealistic terms, unless we want to preach. We have to see that ideals are effective. This attitude may be pragmatism; but pragmatism cannot be avoided in a pragmatic world. The human world is essentially pragmatic.

□

Mencius and Hsun Tzu were two of the most important philosophers of ancient China. Whereas Mencius was, until recently, held in esteem and remained popular, Hsun Tzu lost respect. It is said that the reason is the former's doctrine that human nature is essentially good and the latter's doctrine that it is essentially evil. People are flattered by the former doctrine and dislike the latter. Mahatma Gandhi also believed in the essential goodness of human nature. Our legal procedure assumes that man is essentially good and innocent, and so throws the burden of proof on the shoulders of the plaintiff. But the cases in which the plaintiff succeeds in proving the guilt of the defendant show that human nature is not essentially good. The assumption about human nature, therefore, is only a pragmatic assumption, not an absolute one. And even this assumption does not seem to be necessary; the opposite assumption that human nature is essentially evil can be made in pragmatics, and the defendant in the court may be asked to prove his innocence. This is the practice in some countries. If he succeeds, his success will mean that human nature is not essentially evil.

Now, Mencius and Hsun Tzu were not making pragmatic assumptions, but absolute assumptions. Mahatma Gandhi also seems to have made an absolute assumption. For belief in the ultimate conquest of violence by nonviolence assumes that there is, in the essential nature of even violent men, something that is susceptible and responds to nonviolence and love. Here we add love to nonviolence, and this addition is acceptable to Gandhi. Mere nonviolence, as a neutral state, does not evoke any response from the other. But love is not neutral; it is expansive and produces reaction. In fact, Gandhi uses the words love and nonviolence practically as synonyms.

If every man is essentially good, why has Gandhi admitted that very few can understand the truth and strength of nonviolence? Here lies a great difficulty in the pragmatic world. Gandhi writes: "Violence can only be effectively met by nonviolence. This is an old, established truth. The questioner does not really understand the working of nonviolence. If he did, he would have known that the weapon of violence, even if it was the atom bomb, became useless when matched against true nonviolence. That very few understand how to wield this mighty weapon is true. It requires a lot of understanding and strength of mind. It is unlike what is needed in military schools and colleges. The difficulty one experiences in meeting himsa with ahimsa arises from weakness of mind." The courage of the soldiers trained in military academies is still weakness but not strength. These soldiers do not understand what true strength is; and the nations too, therefore, which train them do not understand true strength.

But why have they not understood their true strength, if every man, by being essentially good, possesses it? Or should we therefore dismiss nonviolence as a panacea offered for all the evils of the world, like the panaceas offered by the different religions? Humanity seems to be disillusioned about the ability of man to adopt the panaceas. Christ preached love; but Christian nations, through the centuries, have been engaged in some of the bloodiest wars. Buddha preached compassion; but the armies, in a number of wars like the Sino-Japanese war, were Buddhist. The only conclusion we can draw—if we accept that human nature is essentially good—from the history of humanity and the realities of the pragmatic world is that what is essentially good in human nature is not always to the fore, and that in the case of the vast majority of men it is as submerged as the Satanism of the libido is submerged in the depths of our being. Both the godly and the ungodly have various levels of existence in our being. (I think that Freud was wrong when he said that the ungodly alone belongs to the unconscious.) As Mencius said, emotions like sympathy and the sense of righteousness are natural to man; but, as Hsun Tzu said, selfishness and jealousy are also natural. If a man or woman does not feel jealous when the loved person loves another, we think that it is unnatural and seek for reasons. However, we wish to appeal to the good in man and we want that the good in him should work; we do not wish to appeal to the evil in him and we want that it should not work. Humanity can survive if the institutions it builds up can succeed in evoking the good in man. If they provoke the evil in man, and if evil can dominate over the good in him, there is little chance of man's survival. And the danger will be greater as the evil becomes stronger.

In the pragmatic world we have to accept, therefore, that both Mencius and Hsun Tzu are right. In this world we should not talk of absolutes. No man is absolutely evil all his life; neither is any one absolutely good all his life. The difference is one of degree and extent. There are religions according to which the root of evil is individuality. But we cannot understand how this teaching, in an absolute sense, is applicable to the human world. I cannot think that my desire to exist as an individual is a moral evil. Otherwise, suicide would not have been a crime; and some religions say that it is even a sin against God. In the pragmatic world, in order to do good I must exist as an individual. Again, in order that I can be good, the good nature in me must express itself in action, but not end up in mere sentimentality. Neither can I accept that the essence of man contains both good and evil. If any man in the world can become good even towards the end of his life, then it is the whole of him that becomes good. If part of his essential nature is necessarily evil, then he cannot get over his essence. Hsun Tzu was right, therefore, only to the extent that the root propensities which can be turned into evil belong to man; but the propensities themselves are not evil. Anger, for instance, is said to be evil. But is not righteous anger necessary to overcome evil? Love is said to be good. But has it not led many a poor lover to commit theft in order to please his beloved? Fear is said to be evil. But more often than not, it is fear of consequences that checks evil-doers. We live in the pragmatic human world, not in the world of saints. I feel inclined towards the opinion that man—if we take the normal man—is good in his essential nature; but the situations in which he finds himself may turn his good nature into evil. But this opinion is about an ultimate.

We have been thinking about normal men. But what should we say about abnormal men? Unfortunately there is no clear-cut distinction—as the psychologists tell us—between normality and abnormality. Within certain degrees, abnormality is not noticed; and below certain still lower degrees, it is not even suspected. Men like Hitler are abnormal. If a man is abnormally good, we call him a saint, a bodhisattva, a mahatma. If he is abnormally evil, we call him satanic, an evil genius. We call neither a lunatic, except in a metaphorical case. But when he begins to forget his personality, we feel sure that he is a lunatic. But there are several shades of difference. It is some of these personalities who are not completely lunatic who work havoc on humanity. And it is not all such personalities whom law regards as above law or below law.

Our pragmatic world consists of all kinds of persons. The absolutely normal, in the strict sense of the term, is a norm. He is the ideal person for whom reason is a stronger drive than propensities leading to evil. Psychologists have not admitted that reason, like instincts, is a drive. But in the "normal" man it is a drive. It is as much a force as the instinct of pugnacity. But because of its freedom from the physiological, and because ordinary men live at the level of the physiological most of their lives—here one may contrast this kind of life with the buddhiyoga of the *Bhagavad-Gita*—the strength of reason is not felt as much as the strength of other propensities. When Aristotle said that God exercises a pull towards Himself through the rational part of man's soul, he was thinking of reason as a force, although he expressed his idea in the current religious and philosophical language. Absolutely normal persons, in the strict sense of the term, are therefore very rare. The vast majority of men fall below the norm, and are therefore not truly normal. It is with reference to such people that we have to think of the practical applications of ahimsa and the banning of nuclear weapons. That the essential nature of man is good is, for the pragmatic world, an ideal to be achieved, not a major premise from which we can draw conclusions as to what man will do in all situations. Man's essential goodness is like a hidden treasure, which has to be dug out and brought up to the surface before it can be used. I think that the authors of our Puranas were pessimistic about the ultimate success of ahimsa in this world; otherwise, they would not have prophesied that Kalki would be born in the future for destroying the evil-doers with the sword in order to establish the kingdom of peace. Perhaps Mahatma Gandhi was born to tell humanity that it had a chance to save God from the trouble of incarnating Himself as Kalki. However, we need not accept the pessimism of the Puranic writers, and we may think about how to establish ahimsa in our world.

The above discussion of the nature of man is necessary because there has been some loose talk about ahimsa and the banning of nuclear weapons. Nothing can be more fruitless and even more dangerous than an unrealistic and sentimental approach to either idea. Mahatma Gandhi was the master of the technique of nonviolence and satyagraha; and after him, its abuses have been more common in India than its proper uses. But the master himself admitted mistakes in the use and the application of the principle. At one stage he discountenanced mass satyagraha, and advocated individual satyagraha. The strength of nonviolence is an inner strength; it belongs to one's spirit, and not to one's body. It can be known and understood by the individual himself, not by others. Others can know that the individual possesses it only when he succeeds, and success here has to be understood not in the sense of having achieved the end for which he offers satyagraha, but in the sense that, even if the end is his own end, he has been able to stick to the principle to the last moment. Because of the inwardness of this strength, Gandhi used to consult his intuition. Socrates would have said that he was consulting his daemon. Ordinary men easily mistake the promptings of their selfish interests for the voices of the daemon.

A realistic approach to the problem of nonviolence requires taking into consideration the nature of the pragmatic world in which the principle has to be practised. Our world consists of ordinary human beings, for whom the essential goodness of man is not a major premise for drawing practical conclusions, but only one of the *possible* inward forces which can be made effective. Otherwise, the laws of ethics and of society and the law courts would have been unnecessary throughout the history of man. No man can be certain which force in the other will begin to act and in which way in any important situation. What "ought" to be done is not always the same as what "is" done and what "will be" done. It is to cancel this difference between the "ought" and the "is" that checks and preventives are needed. These checks are of many forms; and one of them, psychologically effective, is fear of consequences.

Let us first consider nuclear war. It is one kind of war; war with conventional weapons is also war. But our anxiety is focussed on nuclear war rather than on war itself. Anyone can see the reason; it is fear of complete annihilation. There will be no winner and loser in a nuclear war. Both the nations at war will be annihilated. It is fear of annihilation—engendered by the foresight of the Nemesis about which we have no doubts—that is acting as the deterrent to a major war. I remember having read Vinoba Bhave saying that he had no objection to the manufacture of atom bombs by the great powers, because their manufacture was acting as an effective preventive of war on a wide scale. But Sri. Rajagopalachari announced that nuclear weapons should be banned. Both are right if we understand the reasons.

None will deny that the fear of mutual extermination has been preventing war between major powers. None ventures to start it; but each is afraid that the other may start it, and is not quite sure about what the other will do. Fear is thus acting as a check. Each power, in this situation, is not relying upon the essential goodness of man so much as upon his desire to exist and not be annihilated. This is what the Yogic psychologists call abhinivesa or attachment to one's existence. This desire of man is something on which we can generally count. No one wants his own destruction except when one is out of mind. One may say that the fear of annihilation is mean and does not bring out the essential goodness of man on which ahimsa is to be based. But another may say in retort that humanity is not the most desirable species on earth, and so none need shed tears if such a species is annihilated. Russell wrote: "Mankind . . . are a mistake. The universe would be sweeter and fresher without them. . . . I cannot understand how God . . . can have tolerated the baseness of those who boast blasphemously that they have been made in his image." The truth is that, in the pragmatic world, man's essential goodness cannot be so much relied upon as his fear of annihilation. And this truth holds not only in the case of individuals but also in that of nations.

The objection to Vinoba Bhave's opinion is that, if several nations possess nuclear weapons, then some mad person or nation may suddenly one day start a nuclear war, which will engulf the whole earth. Certainly, this is a possibility, and should be prevented as bacterial war should be prevented. Both nuclear and bacterial war should be banned. Sri. Rajagopalachari also is right. So long as one nation possessed the atom bomb, it seemed reasonable to desire that other nations also developed and possessed it.

It seems to be reasonable also to desire that every civilized nation should develop and possess it; for then no bigger nation will bully and threaten a smaller one. We know that three nations at least possess it. Given a few years more, a few more nations will announce its possession. Then, it may be said, lest one of them should, in a fit of bad temper, start the atomic war, the manufacture of nuclear weapons should completely be banned. Yes, they should be banned; there can be no two opinions about banning them. But this is only the first step in our thinking, after assuming that more than one nation has the bomb. The dialectic of thought about nuclear weapons cannot stop here.

When Einstein was asked what the result would be of a third world-war, he said that after it people would fight with bows and arrows. The scientist-philosopher could not say that people would not fight. Even before bows and arrows were invented, people fought with stones; and before that time, they must have fought with their teeth, nails and fists. There was fighting and killing all the same. It is not necessary to possess civilized weapons for humanity to destroy itself. Like the Yadava clan, it can destroy itself with bundles of water grass. Students of savage tribes of even modern times tell us that war between tribes can be a war of extermination. Russell writes: "We read in the Old Testament that it was a religious duty to exterminate conquered races completely." So extermination of whole peoples is not a new fear; the only difference is that primitive tribes are not conscious of the extent of humanity, but we are.

Modern imperialists do not believe in the usefulness of extermination as much as in that of subjugation and of spreading spheres of influence. Correspondingly, there is fear of loss of real independence and of cultural genocide, not of physical extermination. By the abolition of nuclear war we may remove the fear of the total annihilation of humanity or of at least the extermination of the civilized world. If we succeed in the abolition of nuclear war only, can we remove the other fear, namely, the fear of threats, subjugation, and cultural destruction by stronger powers?

There was a time when the strength of a nation was assessed according to the strength of the sinew of the soldiers. Later the strength of the metal used, and still later the amount of gunpowder etc., determined the results of war. Gradually keen intelligence and scientific acumen have become more important for military power than strength of muscle. A small nation possessing atom bombs feels safe from a big nation. But if the former is deprived of its nuclear weapons, it will live in constant fear of the latter. What guarantee, then, can we give to remove this fear? If the fear is not removed but allowed to continue, should we blame the weaker nations if they develop weapons—if not nuclear, then some other—in order to defend themselves and retain the balance of power? Research on nuclear weapons started only for the purpose of depriving nations of the advantages of vaster armaments and bigger numbers.

How then can this fear be removed ? If the advantage of nuclear weapons is cut off, even then some nation will possess some other advantage. Britain for some time possessed the advantage of the strongest navy, and other nations were afraid of her. Such fears also have to be removed. They cannot be removed by the protestations of Samaritanism. There was, and is, good Samaritanism not merely of individuals but also of nations. But it cannot always be relied upon in this world and is not enough to allay the fear. It can be allayed if there is a counter-fear: bigger nations should fear subjugating the smaller ones. Only then can the weaker nations have confidence in themselves and confidence in others. Then there will be less scope for suspicion.

How is this fear to be introduced as a check on the aggression of stronger powers? But until this is done, the banning of nuclear weapons, although good in itself cannot be an effective remedy for international evils. As the power blocs are now deployed, if there is war even without nuclear weapons, the destruction of life and the extent of human suffering will be far greater than in the last World War. An American gentleman said that a Japanese friend told him that, if the atom bomb had not been dropped on Hiroshima, Japan would have been fighting till today on hills and in jungles and the sufferings of the people would have been far greater than they were; the Japanese traditional spirit would not have allowed them to admit defeat and to surrender without the stunning effect of the atom bomb. I do not know whether such a thing would have happened, but it is quite conceivable. We can conceive also of the world divided into two camps and fighting with conventional weapons until half of the earth's population is destroyed. A long-drawn-out war with conventional weapons will not be less destructive than a lightning war with nuclear weapons.

As the world exists today, there is no effective check in it on a powerful aggressor, and he does what he likes under some pretext or the other. The check will be effective only if it originates from a power stronger than that of any aggressor. And this can, if at all, only be the power of the world. How can such a world power come into being is the great question. The League of Nations failed, because its checks were not effective. The United Nations has taken its place; but it is rather a moral force and, like any other moral force, is effective in some favourable situations and ineffective in others. Thinkers have been speaking of a World State. But it cannot yet be visualized and men are doubting that the idea is workable. But that there is a One World feeling has to be accepted. The worries of every nation have now become the concern of every other. If a country is under-developed it is regarded as a danger not only to itself but also to others. Even economic aid, which was once considered to be benevolence, is now a necessity, whatever be the way it is given. Yet, the One World idea has not yet taken a concrete shape; its detailed logical structure has not yet been worked out. It is there only as a vague, general moral principle. But its actualization cannot be postponed too long, however complex a problem it may pose. Only when it is actualized can all war be abolished, and weaker nations feel some relief and have confidence in themselves and in others. Only then will the bigger states be afraid of aggression on the smaller. Until there is total abolition of war, the ban on nuclear weapons alone, in our pragmatic world, will be like curing the symptoms and ignoring the aetiology of the disease. Of course, even curing the symptoms is something useful. Like man, nations also live by love, hope and fear. Every nation should show in its actions that it loves others, it should be hopeful of progress, and should be afraid of aggressing on others.

When India attained her independence and declared that she would follow the Gandhian way, there were some people in the West who began wondering whether she would disband her army. Some even imagined that an experiment in maintaining internal order would be made without the executive power of the police. But almost on the wake of independence, the Kashmir and Hyderabad (Deccan) incidents followed. Even Mahatma Gandhi's funeral procession was accompanied by the military. (Gandhi had said that he would meet Hitler's army with an army of nonviolent resisters!) All these events showed that Indian leaders were aware of realistic politics. Still, foreign political experts were doubting whether India was realistic enough in her external policies, and whether her idealism did not make her blind to some realities.

What are the conditions under which the goodness of man can become evil? What are they that make man act in an evil way? They may be roughly classified into two kinds: provocatives and opportunities. We can easily understand provocatives: they are positive happenings in the human world, like injustices, which cannot be remedied in accepted ways. Sometimes we call opportunities temptations. Generally man is tempted to do evil when he thinks that there is nothing to check him and that there is no fear of consequences. In a well-organized and strong society, whether national or international, there should be neither provocatives nor opportunities for doing evil. Opportunities are removed when the fear of availing oneself of them is introduced. Manu says that even the sannyasin should not sleep in the same room in which his mother or sister sleeps. The essential goodness of even the saint is not trusted by Manu, although he believes that the deepest essence of man is divine. He therefore wants to place checks, and does not allow any opportunity for evil. Even if the world consists of only saints, Manu will not believe in anarchism and will not say that we can leave everything to the essential goodness of man. And his view holds all the more true in the case of our pragmatic world of national or international societies. The checks on possible evil, wilful or not, must be clear and strong. Then nonviolence can work on the largest scale.

Provocatives of evil are too many. No doubt, the world contains several kinds of evil: natural calamities like earthquakes, volcanoes and storms, pestilences and diseases, deaths, etc. But we are not concerned with them, but only with human evil which comes under ethics. Nonviolence, which we are discussing, is a moral principle and it is considered to be a moral force issuing from the essential goodness in them. We are therefore concerned with moral evil. The shortest definition of moral evil I can think of is that it is the gap between ideals and practice. If a man or nation professes certain ideals and does not live up to them in his or its activities, he is or it is morally guilty. One may say that the ideals of a group may not be moral enough and therefore it is able to live up to them. But the question is not whether *we* know them to be not high enough, but whether that group knows them to be not high enough. If it does, then it is guilty; if it does not, then it is not guilty. I cannot think that our ancestors who did not think that polygamy was immoral and the ancestors of certain Himalayan races who did not think that polyandry was immoral are all now in hell just for that thought and practice. Many of the civilized nations now think that a succession of marriages, divorce following divorce, is moral or at least legal; but simultaneity is a moral horror and a legal crime. I am not prepared to judge which form is morally worse: simultaneity or succession of spouses. But who are we to pronounce judgement upon and condemn the moral codes of other times and other societies, when we are not following our own sincerely? We shall be right only in judging whether those societies lived up to the ideals they accepted and knew. Moral evil is the difference between what we know to be right and what we do. To be morally responsible for what one does, one must know what is right; if there is no such knowledge, we do not say that one is immoral but that one is ignorant. Ignorance in several cases is not excusable; but that is a different question.

The gap between ideals and practice appears in society in several forms. Many forms of this gap, unfortunately, do not come under the control of law. Even in the case of those which come under its purview, there are possibilities not only of circumventing but also of defeating law. Evil provokes and evokes evil, unless it is checked and punished. It provokes evil in retaliation and evokes evil in imitation. If one goes scot-free after committing a crime and amasses a fortune, others will like to do the same. If one commits a crime against another and the latter finds that the law cannot help him, he takes the law into his own hands, the sympathies of society are with him, but the law is against him and he suffers a double injury. A society in which evil spreads in either way becomes disorderly and the society in which it spreads in the former way is unhealthy in addition, since it accepts evil tacitly and denies it overtly. Tacit acceptance and overt denial is an additional evil.

It is often said that, when we evaluate the culture of a people, we should take only the ideals they uphold, but not their practices we encounter. I do not know who first laid down the principle, but many of us were made acquainted with it first after Miss Mayo published her *Mother India*. There is truth in this principle, for in every country practices fall short of ideals. We expect that ideals are framed as guides to practices in order to transform and ennoble them. But one recluse, in a mood of disgust with what he saw around him, said that ideals are built up by some countries in contrast to practices. For instance, a people may be too materialistic in their practical life, but may build up grand idealistic philosophies. Such a phenomenon is certainly conceivable, and is sometimes true also. Such philosophies cannot be representative of the life of the people, but only of the ideals they can build up in thought. Therefore, whether the ideals are representative or not of the actual life of the people and how far they are representative are reasonable questions. The question will be: Are there effective checks to prevent the people from acting against the ideals? If the answer is affirmative, we can conclude that the people are serious about their ideals.

The ideal of nonviolence can be no exception to the rule that there have to be checks on practices wherever they deviate from ideals. If two men or two nations agree to adopt an ideal, there should be checks also on deviations. Generally people think that nonviolence is only physical. But it is mental also. There is mental torture, just as there is physical torture; there is mental compulsion, just as there is physical compulsion. In times of war, there is physical violence; and in times of peace, there is mental violence. Some forms of mental violence are called psychological warfare. When a man or nation cannot counter an intrigue by starting another intrigue, it uses violence to cut down the manoeuvre or quietly suffers. Apparently there is no physical violence, but an intrigue hurts all the same. From the moral point of view, both physical and mental violence are equally evil. Gandhi wrote: "It has been suggested by American friends that the atom bomb will bring in ahimsa (nonviolence) as nothing else can. It will, if it is meant that its destructive power will so disgust the world that it will turn away from violence for the time being. This is very like a man gluttting himself with dainties to the point of nausea and turning away from them only to return with redoubled zeal after the effect of nausea is well over. Precisely in the same manner will the world return to violence with renewed zeal after the effect of disgust is worn out." Gandhi here speaks of disgust, because the scale of human misery produced disgust in him. But it is really the horror of war that is preventing nations from physical cambat. Just as we think of the horrors of war, one may say, we should think of the horrors of peace time, unless and untill mental violence also is eradicated. Hate does not simulate as love in war, but it does so in peace. Gandhi did not mean by nonviolence merely absence of physical violence. He added love to its connotation. How can there be love if there is mental violence? And how can we be sure that mental violence will not lead to physical violence? In the pragmatic world love has to be actualized in practice. It has to express itself in men and nations doing good to one another. Co-existence is not indifference to one another; it is cooperative existence, whether of individuals or of nations. In a world in which every nation is somehow concerned about every other nation, indifferent co-existence is out of question. Conditions have to be created for cooperation. The spirit of cooperation must be aroused, and there should be preventives to check hostilities, mental or physical. But preventives are not guides; ideals alone can be guides.

Even within a nation there can be physical and mental violence. Just as there are cold war and hot war between nations, we can think of cold war and hot war within a nation. The latter we call civil war. The former takes several forms. When rivalry between two political parties reaches a particular point, there is a cold war and mental violence. If a murderer escapes law, my sense of justice is hurt. If a big businessman evades income tax, he is using violence against his society. If an important officer takes large bribes with immunity, he also is using violence. Examples can be multiplied. Some of these practices are called violations of law. But law is an expression of the conscience of society; and these practices do violence against that conscience and have very adverse effects on it. They both provoke and evoke evil. This kind of violence may be called moral violence, but it is as much an evil as physical violence because it does not allow true ahimsa to work. And for the strength and solidarity of a nation, there should be effective checks on even moral violence. The fear of the consequences of such violence must be strong enough, like the fear of the consequences of nuclear war.

Will a time come in the history of the moral progress of individuals and societies when the above checks will not be necessary? I cannot venture an answer. But if it comes, ahimsa will reign absolute and supreme. Till then checks and fear of consequences alone can help in the propagation of ahimsa.

So far has been given a realistic appraisal of ahimsa and of the success of banning nuclear weapons. Gandhi himself said that only a few can understand the strength of ahimsa. Those few are Christ, Mahavira, Buddha, and Gandhi himself. I should not be mistaken for one who has no faith in ahimsa, for speaking of the need for checks, fear of consequences and so on. But one has to be realistic in one's attitude and take into consideration the realities in which the Gandhian way can succeed. There can be no two opinions on the Gandhian way: it is the most sublime. However in order to remove possible misunderstanding, I may say briefly that ahimsa, in the full sense in which Gandhi understood the term, can succeed only if the situation in which it is used is turned into a moral situation. If ahimsa is to succeed, all political situations have to be turned into meaningful moral situations.

A GANDHIAN MODEL FOR WORLD POLITICS

Paul F. Power

Many interpreters of Gandhi's life and thought agree that he combined two aspects, the prophetic and the strategic. There is less agreement as to which of these currents prevailed in the career and ideas of a leader of the modern age, although a variety of commentators have decided that he both witnessed and struggled in rare and great ways. Without attempting to suggest whether Gandhi was more teacher or strategist, I will restrict myself in this essay to some observations about how both characteristics contribute to a Gandhian model for world politics. I have chosen international politics as a frame of reference because I believe the extranational lessons of free India's principal architect have been understated owing to his immediate and much publicized impact on the history of the subcontinent. My undertaking begins with a summary of key essentials of Gandhi's teachings as they seem to bear on world affairs. The operation of a Gandhian strategy in international politics will then be explained, followed by an assessment of the significance and utility of the model as it appears in today's interstate milieu.

□

At least as early as 1906 Gandhi exhibited the quest for truth which in his lifetime manifested itself in concerns from vegetarianism to brahmacharya, with the central point the commitment to an activist search for proximate certainty, hinged on a confidence in a ground of being or God. Gandhi did not expect to find certainty in a temporal sense. Instead he left a theological realm that transcends human affairs to define unchanging truth. Numerous commentators from E. Stanley Jones to Dhirendra Mohan Datta have explored the importance of this realm which is clarified with the help of Paul Tillich's thought. At least there is wider audience today for Gandhi's "theism" when it is understood as the well of being rather than as a personal divinity who guides history. Gandhi prepared the way for this reinterpretation by his Truth-God which shocked the orthodox in the 1920s but is itself too narrow for many today.

There is less difficulty in finding assent to Gandhi's call for courageous, selfless actions as the rule of life, and to ahimsa. I understand ahimsa as the optimum, functional good on the way to ultimate truth, and not as an unconditionally binding law of nonviolence on social and political affairs. Here there is a division among the interpreters, the bulk of them insisting, as I do not, that the prophet laid down an ethic of absolutist pacifism. Obviously this discussion has far-reaching implications for a Gandhian model for world politics. To elaborate on my understanding is not possible in this space. I can only state in an inadequate fashion that I find Gandhi's political thought to say that the superordinate requirements of national interest may require the adherent of a Gandhian approach to condone violence without recommending it. This view is not necessarily escapist casuistry, although it may have been in certain phases of the Gandhian movement before and after Indian freedom. For loyalty to the nation, although it is not the good, is a considerable good in the Gandhian hierarchy of values. It is above familial, class and regional loyalties, as proven in decisions which Gandhi made himself. The Gandhian model is clearly a nationalist model, a point not overturned by arguments that the object of the Indian leader's loyalty was and is something less than an integrated, national society. The saving quality of this nationalism is not in its juridical nature which is underdeveloped and not even in its domestic social values, beneficial as they are in raising depressed segments and moderating intergroup struggle, but in the political ethics of nationalism. For Gandhi insisted that loyalty should be organized in keeping with the rule of selfless action, the merits of ahimsa and a coordinate national state. Writing about the relations between the village and higher authorities, Gandhi once said that "there will be ever-widening never ascending circles . . . at last the whole becomes one life composed of individuals, never aggressive in their arrogance but ever humble, sharing the majesty of the oceanic circle of which they are integral units. Therefore, the outermost circumference will not wield power to crush the inner circle, but will give strength to all within and derive its own strength from it."[1] The idealized nation of Gandhi's thought is organized for protection of constituent units and their citizens, a negative achievement at the cost of total effectiveness, but worthy in a Lockean perspective. The division of power and the ethical obligations of the "outermost circumference", i.e., the central government, suggests that any Gandhian nation would not commit internal aggression. Gandhi's reluctance to industrialize further suggests that a national state established on his preferences would not have the military capability to do more than to provide for its own territorial integrity. His self-sufficiency notions and call for non-injury may imply that this minimum defence would be difficult to achieve for the country producing few modern arms and reluctant to use them because of normative inhibitions.

Externally, Gandhi's teachings suggest interstate relationships based on domestic values and institutions. The international community of a Gandhian type rests on the internal nature of Gandhian politics. Social harmony is basic to this nature. The unity and agreement of social classes in their "true" needs and aspirations, and the denial of the inevitability of class warfare are important elements of the harmony. In his letter of 12 May 1936 to Nehru, reprinted in the late Prime Minister's *A Bunch of Old Letters*, Gandhi indicated some of his thoughts on the symmetry of classes and how he disagreed with Nehru's Marxian analysis. Aware and critical of exploitation, Gandhi had confidence that appeals to stewardship and an inherent charity would bring about a redistribution of wealth without calling in the power of the state. Despite his opposition to many institutional devices to solve or moderate social ills through the power of the state, it is reasonably clear that he consented sufficiently to the use of governmental power for these purposes to say that his lesson is to reform without increasing tensions and antagonism. The work of Rabindra Nath Bose and V.B. Kher on Gandhian ideas and practices in industrial relations indicates the details of the social and economic reforms. By projection into international affairs, they deny the Marxist-Leninist proposition that the relations of states are the conflicts of classes, subject to the law of inevitable struggle. In its place he offered a genuine doctrine of peaceful coexistence whereby classes are the phantoms of social life and real interests are identifiable in everyman's being without regard to stratification according to education, income, tasks or other differentiations. There is a Gandhian theme in today's Arab and African "socialism" that rules out class warfare and stresses unity. The Gandhian tradition prescribes relationships which are established on the grounds of ahimsa and works against existing or proposed relationships that alienate, oppose or conflict. None the less reform is sought, not the preservation of iniquities, a subject I will return to in the discussion of operational questions.

If the clash of interests said to flow from class memberships is not part of a Gandhian model for world affairs, what of the collision of sovereignties? Considered as power or force that must rest on violence, sovereignty does not seem to be compatible with Gandhi's ethical thought. Yet the "India of His Dreams", nonviolent as it would be, is not stateless; there is sovereignty in the meaning of authority which directs the national community through consent to legitimate power. Gandhian states possess this kind of sovereignty which emerges from within national societies to give them identity, substance and purpose. In their dealings these states would tend to avoid creation of an inter-sovereign system, including military alliances and international organizations. Rather they would emphasize right conduct with fellow Gandhian states and also with those political entities, sovereign in the traditional way, that hopefully will reorganize their internal life to become Gandhian. The absence among the Gandhian states of conventional international organization will facilitate the growth of the number of units in the fellowship.

The United Nations, for all of its virtues, is no help to creating, maintaining or enlarging the number of Gandhian states. The United Nations was established with few Gandhian principles, which argue against its stateness, non-observance of swadeshi, and attraction to exclusivist ideologies.

A resume of the prophetic side of the Gandhian paradigm could not fail to mention the pervading atmosphere of comity. Self-reliance in domestic matters does not mean self-help in interstate relations. Independent action is not prohibited, but dharmic responsibilities exclude military or economic expansionism and any drive for power and goods at the expense of others. Foreign policies are shaped by national interest but these are always subject to values that minimize the impact on policy of capability in the usual power terms. Although Gandhian ethics do not explain away the uneven distribution of power, they purpose that the gradations ought not to weigh most in the calculations of how interstate behaviour should take place.

□

The strategic and tactical operation of Gandhian prescriptions might first be discussed with reference to the dynamics of sacrifice and struggle. The origins of the first go deep into the Indian and Western sources of Gandhi's thought and of the second into his South African phase when he developed satyagraha from diverse materials. To sacrifice in one's own being is to cooperate with truth, and to cooperate is to endure sacrifice, including loss of life if necessary to uphold truth. Adjustments are permissible and perhaps obligatory in both processes. Reconciliation of opposing forces may or may not take place in these processes. There is an assumption that the opponent is redeemable, whoever he may be. Gandhi's open letter to Hitler in July 1939 illustrated this conviction. Negotiations between States are thereby implicitly supported in many situations and there is a call for the adjustment of adjustable things. But there are truthful things to be struggled for that do not permit of adjustment, but must be obtained or, if not, no compromise can be made about them. Joan V. Bondurant and other writers on the Gandhian contribution have done much to show the resolving power of satyagraha in conflict situations. I would only stress that non-resolvable matters are integral to the Gandhian strategy which sometimes runs the risk of becoming unbending in demanding that certain positions or objectives are not subject to negotiation. Gandhi would have agreed with Adam Smith about man's basic propensity to barter and trade, but there are other fundamentals that require determination and perhaps rigidity unaffected by the solvent of the usual types of bargaining. Reconciliation in the Gandhian direction, yes, but not in the sector of fixed values. It is difficult to believe that Gandhi bargained for temple-entry, although he did for the release of imprisoned followers. In world affairs, the Gandhian strategy is not likely to permit negotiations about the remnants of imperialism and nuclear deterrence, although it might about racial segregation. The sacrificial characteristic will appear whenever there is no room for bargaining. During moments of permissible bargaining, active engagement of the parties is required, together with frank, advance disclosure of intentions by the Gandhians and their willingness to settle for less than their demands. Within the bargaining process there is a sense of timing that is concerned with what pacific technique can be employed to the best advantage, but more importantly with an awareness as to when either positive results are imminent and a change in tactics is indicated or the frontier between negotiable issues and those which are not is approaching. Throughout means remain means and not ends-in-the-making. The Gandhian view of ends and means is traditional in that he saw them as discrete things. Granting the "purity of means" idea to be true for the Gandhian strategy, I find reason to believe that he kept a distinction between ends and means that the Huxley and Dewey schools may have overlooked. For interstate conduct this implies that Gandhian states will differentiate between their techniques with which they seek to advance their principles and the norms themselves. There should be no confusion leading, for example, to negotiations for their own sake, as in certain phases of the Macmillan approach to summit meetings. There are times when it is necessary to fast in diplomatic silence. As to struggle which is not part of bargaining, the Gandhian tradition suggests some irrelevant lessons and some that may be valuable. About the Indian leader's recommendation of nonviolent direct action between states in World War II, there was wisdom in Jawaharlal Nehru's comment in the Lok Sabha on 26 July 1955, that "no government will or can perform satyagraha". Although the Indian government subsequently condoned private force to try a nonviolent invasion of Goa, it may be well to note that the attempt and the tragic results were "a travesty" of Gandhian principles according to Pyarelal. The Goan issue was resolved finally, of course, through traditional violence, much to the dismay of Western critics. But the West should remember that Delhi used restraint of a high order for many years, even if the 1961 takeover of Portuguese India raised some questions about consistency in the statements of the Prime Minister. As to other proposals for nonviolent action against a state, there is the instance of Bertrand Russell's call for neutralist ships to enter the Christmas Island testing site. However judged, these proposals, many of them involving private citizens, seem clearly in keeping with Gandhian ideas.

More relevant in my analysis is the contribution of the Gandhian strategy to socializing dissent. This is hardly a historic innovation, but it is a significant development. For the Gandhian strategy progresses through group action and responsibility. There is no place for a Thoreau, no matter how important the need to have atomic convictions about injustice and individual acts of disobedience. Socialized dissent, as the American people have learned in the Negro Revolt, and the United Kingdom in the demonstrations of nuclear pacifism, is considerably more dramatic than isolated convictions and acts of disobedience in the name of justice. But is it effective in reaching goals? Dissent of this kind may be counterproductive. It has become so in the civil rights activities of the United States. Actually there has been doubt for some time about the extent of Gandhian belief oustide of elite pacifists like Martin Luther King, Jr. and N. Bayard Rustin. Effective or not, socialized protest of the Gandhian type is potentially an international device to pressure governments for interstate reasons as well as for what may seem to be domestic issues. The general strike tradition proved to be a failure. The Gandhian strike, bypassing courts and legislatures, is a tool for bringing about changes in foreign policies through the withdrawal of services, the interruption of communications and similar actions. To take only one example, it is not improbable to foresee an American Negro protest on behalf of Africans in South Africa. That there are serious impediments to the emergence of these interstate protests is equally clear. Protest is often culture-bound, leading to a circumscribed vision that would keep "wrongs" below the horizon of the dissenters. The grievance to arouse is probably local, otherwise it may go unheeded by those who are not directly affected. None the less international race consciousness may prove to have the psychological bonds to overcome these limitations.

Satyagraha resistance against totalitarianism has received the endorsement of several Gandhians and there are signs that there is increased interest in this use among students of nonviolent action. I would hold that the human costs are too high to justify this use. Without reviewing the debates about this employment, other than to mention that the "nature of the enemy" approach is central to many of them, it might be valuable to suggest that a related field is that of civil disobedience and civil resistance. In this area there is the possible utility of Gandhian type resistance in post-nuclear-strike circumstances when the opponent tries to occupy the "defeated" nation. This resistance must be distinguished from guerrilla struggle, passive resistance, and monastic-type disengagement. Discussion of resistance cadres for use after a nuclear attack and the landing of the attackers has usually focussed on paramilitary forces that are not Gandhian. On the other hand, true believers have tended to avoid discussion of satyagraha after the evil deed. There is an opportunity to consider two "unthinkables" that are infrequently joined, nuclear conflict and satyagraha resistance. At a minimum the Gandhian tradition recommends a study of these two by policy makers, however sceptical they may be about political effectiveness, sufficiency of morale and other problems.

A final comment on the socialization of dissent is that it implies the collaboration of Gandhian states when they differ with other sovereignties. Alliances would seem inconsistent with the ideals of the model, but they would support cooperation for mutual principles and interests of the Indo-American type. In the prosecution of their differences with other states the Gandhian nations would have mutual obligations, the chief one being to keep the struggle ahimsatic so that the ethical costs of "winning" or "losing" are less than the costs in conventional struggle using coercion or violence.

□

It is no easy task to consider the relevance of the Gandhian prescriptions and strategy for the contemporary world. But if one accepts R.R. Diwakar's teaching that satyagraha made Mahatma Gandhi, and not the reverse, and that it would outlive him, the Gandhian model offers norms and techniques for our age. Among the general contributions is a nationalism of universal rules, no small achievement in a time when nationalism, especially in the new States, suggests that the defects of former norms justify the creation of another set of parochial standards for domestic and external behaviour. For example, the play-off game of the uncommitted with the superpowers is non-Gandhian, however understandable it may be in terms of economic and military weakness.

Both large and small powers can benefit from the Gandhian lesson that correct relationships avoid violence and militarism, and passivity and appeasement. Concretely, the arms control field is a zone where Western pacifism, which Gandhi criticized for its simplicity and either-or characteristics, might benefit through a re-examination of unilateralism and the exact geometry of nuclear deterrence and peace-keeping. Doubtless the Gandhian model is without this deterrence, but it also suggests how those with a problem can gradually extricate themselves from an awesome burden without sacrificing honour. The current phase of "mutual example" in American-Soviet efforts to achieve at least surface progress towards disarmament is in the Gandhian tradition, although concepts of psychological bargaining are involved that pay scant attention to Gandhian trust in the opponent.

Scepticism about the model is warranted in several areas. For the complex problems of reducing the defence segment of the American economy, the Gandhian norms and methods have little relevance. The record on transferring nonviolent resistance, even if limited to the Western imperialism the Indian leader did so much to destroy, is discouraging in view of the recent history of Algerian nationalism, British Guiana, Central and Southern Africa, and Southeast Asia. The exceptions have tended to be individuals rather than movements—Chief John Luthuli is an outstanding case. The responsibility for the meagre results can be placed with the un-British Dutch, French and Portuguese imperialists, turning aside from Gandhi's thesis that satyagraha does not depend on English scruples. Satyagraha did transfer, apart from imperialism, to the English-speaking democracies to fortify prior traditions of direct action in the new quests for peace and equality. It has also persisted, as Minoo Adenwalla has observed critically, as a disturbing factor in India to feed discontent and challenge a national regime. For all its high norms the Gandhian tactic of disobedience may have weakened the better institutions of the world, i.e., those which are more rather than less democratic. Satyagraha may have caught hold where the need has not been critical.

There is also the question whether the Gandhian strategy really avoids inflicting psychic, social or political damage on the adversary, an important and vexing issue I can only raise in this essay. At a minimum there seems to be a problem of unintended results that are not consistent with Gandhian ethics when the struggle over the non-negotiable values or objectives inflicts harm on the opponent. Although individuals and political parties may become Gandhian, States may have to adopt a modified policy that admits that the ethical costs of world politics are likely to exceed those of internal affairs.

To return to the positive side, the Gandhian model implies the placement of particular values above the rituals of law, the restoration of obligation and sacrifice as effective concepts, and the elevation of self-reliance from an individual to a collective norm. The contributions to peaceful change, anti-imperialism and social justice require no special mention other than to cite them as elements of continuing worth.

Karl Jaspers has commented that the Gandhian way creates a suprapolitics summed up in the renunciation of violence but not of politics itself. Although he admires this ability to do both, Jaspers does not believe that the contents and methods of Gandhian politics are transferable and exemplary. I have expressed doubts about the first question. Yet I would argue that another view is tenable. For the Gandhian model, despite difficulties of transference that cannot be dissolved with hope, offers an international society of autocephalous units that does not require a world culture to transmit the Gandhian outlook and methods. They arise from the impact on national institutions of certain prophecy. This prophecy is exemplary because it closes the distance between civic health and private charity, and in the world community, lessens instabilities through encouragement of self-development under moral restraints.

The Gandhian model is further distinguished by its liberating message of good news. This is not a message of unilinear progress, but it does break through cyclical theories of history known to the West as well as the East. For all of his Hinduism Gandhi represented a departure from any tradition which accepts recurrent patterns of life and thought. He proclaimed a freedom and power of man to refashion destiny and to move, however painfully, out of fatalism and into a time of self-determination in individual and collective affairs.

---

1. *Harijan*, 28 July 1946.

A NONVIOLENT INTERNATIONAL AUTHORITY

Ted Dunn

The contribution made by Gandhi towards the understanding of the means which make for peace has been for me of inestimable value, yet I have the feeling that for most people, especially those of us in the West, he does not quite speak to our condition. This may be because the problems of today are not those which faced Gandhi, perhaps also because of our different environment. Gandhi's struggle was to regain freedom, whereas the main challenge facing the nations today is how to preserve it, and how to establish an international authority capable of restraining an aggressor by nonviolent means. Until we can establish such an authority, it seems to me more than likely that nations will continue to rely on their own defence.

Gandhi's insistence on Truth therefore needs relating to these changed circumstances. Truth, Gandhi believed, was another way of describing God, and as I believe God is the author of nature, which we can observe around us, I think it will help to examine more closely how the laws of God are observed, and how these can form the basis of International Law.

The idea of Natural Law has been held by international lawyers for a very long time, and was given clear expression by Grotius three hundred years ago, when he said that "it is composed of the dictates of right reason, which pointed out the act according as it is or is not in conformity with nature, and has a quality of moral baseness or moral necessity, and either forbidden or enjoined by God, the author of nature". This belief in Natural Law coming from a body of people in close contact with the enforcement of international law deserves far more examination than has yet been given by peace-workers. What follows is an attempt to understand more of this concept, because clearly, if there are natural forces more powerful than violence, we should attempt to discover them.

Grotius, we note, states that Natural Law is based on the dictates of right reason, while Gandhi, as we know, insisted on discovering Truth. From both these approaches emerges a new morality and a new awareness, giving birth to the enforcement of law, or, as Gandhi termed it, "truth force".

This search for truth and right reason between nations can well be undertaken by Unesco, because only Unesco can combine the resources of many nations thus making their conclusions more acceptable to all. The potential resources of Unesco are still not appreciated by most people, although many valuable beginnings have already been made. Let us hope that far more information and knowledge will soon be assembled which can be disseminated around the world through U.N. information centres. Modern means of communication have tremendous possibilities both for good and for evil, and large numbers of people can now assimilate knowledge which they are eager to acquire if the matter is presented in the right manner. For instance, we are now often made acutely aware, through TV, of poverty in other lands and of how people abroad live and work. The assembling of facts may not seem very exciting to most people, but nevertheless once gathered, if they point conclusively in one direction, slowly but surely they gain acceptance. Thus, without peoples consciously becoming more moral, they come to accept a new code of behaviour, because they now have an understanding of the other's problems.

We are fortunate today that there are many studies and sciences which can throw much valuable light on the problems before us, and we urgently need to enrol the help of educationalists, historians, psychologists, anthropologists, sociologists, industrialists and, not least, those whose approach is to study the whole ecology of life. Such studies could well be taught in schools such as those pioneered by Grundtvic in Denmark and extended to most of Scandinavia, an experiment which has resulted, I believe, in many advanced forms of cooperation, social security, and the remarkable degree of nonviolent resistance under Hitler. It is probably not too much to say that the one single act well within our power to effect, and one which would really go to the root of the problem before us, would be to encourage the growth of similar schools. Only when people have a better appreciation of the art of living can the techniques of nonviolence be really effective.

I have stressed the need for more research and education as a means of discovering Truth and right reason because, although research and education is being stressed on all sides, practically none of it is related to the arts of peace. Even where there is an awakening to the need, considerable uncertainty seems to exist as to where to begin. This uncertainty could be resolved I suggest by a combined attempt by many sciences to appreciate more fully the concept of natural law as understood in the Middle Ages and outlined by St Thomas Aquinas and others. Until we discover the source of true power we cannot establish a new world pattern under the rule of law and justice. Already many of the newer social sciences have much to offer, and their knowledge needs relating to peace. For instance, we hear much about the manner in which people can be conditioned, usually for evil ends. We hear little of how people could be conditioned through their environment to become peaceful, although Plato long ago always insisted on the profound effects of environment. Whether we approve or not, the fact is that we are all being conditioned. At present our environment encourages violence, perhaps because people compete against each other instead of cooperating, or because there is little reverence for personality. One of the reasons that so much of our peace work falls on deaf ears is this unfavourable environment. It is also the reason why the idea of nonviolent resistance as a technique only is doomed to fail. Until people feel within themselves some instinct pulling in a certain direction peace workers will continue swimming against the tide of opinion. We need to understand far more also about what the analytical psychologists call the "Self or Mid-point of Personality", and what the Quakers call "that of God in every man". Ultimately it is only through this self and through our environment that the peace we seek will be found.

This belief in the profound effects of environment is echoed by Dag Hammarskjold's view that it "seems imperative to push forward institutionally and, eventually, constitutionally all along the line guided by current needs and experiences, without preconceived ideas of the ultimate form". By this I understand him to mean that only by cooperating together through international agencies can the nations create the constitutional means for creating the international authority we seek. This idea seems to be borne out by the experience of the Common Market countries and other countries with close federal associations. Yet we lack an understanding of why and how such cooperation leads to the ends we desire. Probably one reason is that individuals, and communities, need a loyalty to their immediate family, and through that family to the community of which that family is part. No man and no nation is an island. We all need to feel wanted by others and to do work which is both creative and of value, and we know from psychology that if these instincts are denied or suppressed, aggression is very probable. This need to feel wanted and to be creative needs to be related to discover the structure within which it can flourish. Evil and aggression can be overcome by understanding and cooperating with Natural Law and that of God within man. This cooperation can be established if we organize and create a favourable structure governing relationships between groups and nations. This means power itself needs decentralizing to the local level because only then can it be prevented from getting out of control. For instance, we may learn that the long period of peace under Pax Romana owed much to the fact that the Romans believed intensely in the healthiness of a local, really local loyalty, while at the same time they extended the privileges of Roman citizenship to all free men in the empire.

Fortunately, I see considerable hope for the future, as well as dangers, because in many respects the world is moving in the right direction. It should be the responsibility of peace workers to understand this direction and encourage it. So far, the movement is a very faltering one, and often the right action is taken for the wrong reason. I see the world moving in the right direction because more and more countries are becoming independent, and regional administration—at least in England—is seriously being discussed. Even in Russia the long-term aim is to decentralize and give more local autonomy. This trend throughout the world towards decentralization of power can be justified on economic grounds and needs encouraging. A further sign I find hopeful is the manner in which nations are slowly learning to cooperate. Again this is largely because it is economic common sense to do so.

Arising from this cooperaion there are powerful unseen forces which statesmen have to respect. Unfortunately the reverse is often the case, and we find that those who are supposed to be in power are helpless to prevent a trend going in the wrong direction. Cooperation between the nations on the other hand can give rise to favourable forces, because when there is cooperation, it becomes increasingly difficult to hurt others without hurting oneself even more. This cooperation, together with appreciation of values and the assimilation of facts relating to history and social affairs, combines to create a favourable climate of world opinion. For example, this climate of world opinion is responsible for aid to undeveloped lands. There is probably also a realization that the well-being of the wealthy nations depends to some extent on the well-being of all nations and, as a result, aid is being given. It is not yet being given in the right manner, through bilateral agreements instead of through the U.N., but at least the will to help is there. What is not seen clearly is the manner in which the above hopeful indications lead to the increasing of the authority of the U.N. This increased authority is being found in many of the above ways, and their existence can be proved by the manner in which statesmen today are being forced to respect world opinion, which only a few years ago they would have ignored. At least nations today consider the effect of their actions on world opinion and attempt, where possible, to avoid coming into conflict with it. We need to increase this natural trend.

I have mentioned above the need for much more research, yet one of the saddest facts of modern life is that, as science has progressed, it has inevitably led to specialization, leading to the separation of one science from another, with the result that it has become increasingly difficult to see the problem as a whole. This need to see the problem as a whole is particularly important in peace work. It may help us to understand this fact better if we think of war as a disease and instead of attempting to suppress the germ which causes the disease, we concentrate more on discovering the means which enable the healthy body to overcome it in a natural manner. With disease, in nearly all forms of life, we notice that when the germ or bacteria causing the disease is suppressed, amazing results are often obtained and health restored. Yet, because nature works slowly, and because the laws of nature are not always observed or understood, nature has an awkward way of recoiling, and what is thought of as success turns out to be failure. Nature has laws which we can ignore, or flout, only at our peril. We can cooperate with nature and remarkable results can be achieved, as any scientist will recognise, but we can only fight against nature for a short-term advantage. For instance, there is a distinct danger now that we may be upsetting the whole balance of nature through the apparently harmless DDT and other similar poisons. Fortunaly, in England, some of these have recently been banned, but not before considerable losses have been noted in wild life. A similar recoil by nature is happening in Rhodesia where the Tsetse fly is reappearing in vast numbers after having gained immunity to a particular poison. Radiation is a further hazard both to plant and animal life. Nature, it seems, will always have the last word. Let us hope that in all fields of life, human, animal or plant, there will be a further awakening to the need to study this ecology of life before it is too late. The dangers are gradually being recognised, but because of man's belief in his superior intellect, he tends to fall into the error of assuming that he, and he alone, can suppress and kill the disease. Mankind has still to discover his humility before God, the author of nature, and to recognise that although we can perform wonders with His cooperation, we can only court disaster by ignoring it. This surely is a principle which affects all aspects of life and is one that was followed by Gandhi when he fasted and dieted. If this is so, then we should always be striving to create the conditions of health so that the body itself can overcome the disease. The same emphasis on health should apply also to the disease of war. Only by creating a healthy society and world order can war be eliminated.

This problem of health can be shown clearly if we consider the needs of plants. We know the importance of combining the right proportions of warmth, water supply, soil conditions, food and so on. If any one of these is inadequate, or in too abundant supply, disease is inevitable. Fotunately, nature allows a large measure of error, and there is more than one way of growing a healthy plant, but no one would expect to grow a water-loving plant on dry sandy soil without applying plenty of water, or a crop of corn on a badly drained field. It is essential to understand the conditions required by the plant's whole environment for success. In the same way, peace comprises many parts, and if it is to be attained it will demand the resources of the peace worker being devoted to every aspect of living. This is why I think many disciplines are needed to cooperate to discover these natural ways of overcoming the disease of war.

The problem of health can also be demonstrated in many other fields, and recent developments in mental health and delinquency can be used to illustrate this. No longer do we chain people in asylums and place them in conditions which can only lead to their becoming worse. Progressive thought dealing with delinquency shows the need for discipline, but a discipline arising from concern for the personality of the delinquent.

The short length of this essay prevents me from making a detailed examination of these examples, but one example I must briefly mention, and this concerns the need by people for law, order and justice. In many instances of delinquency, if not all, love has either been absent or expressed in such a manner so to be only harmful. Love, if it is to be real love, needs to give a feeling of security together with an opportunity for adventure. Above all, however, there must be order and the recognition that only within a framework of order can real love be possible. Love requires more than compassion, forgiveness and all the other virtues normally associated with the word love. It demands, as Gandhi always insisted, a search for truth, or as Grotius put it, a search for right reason. Only when we have found this knowledge can we love effectively. Truth when it is found contains within itself a force which demands respect. Similarly, in international affairs, only when we know how to cultivate the soil of international relationships, to understand its structure and organization for instance, not forgetting to understand the importance of the personality both of the individual and the group of which the individual is a part, only then will the true nonviolent international authority we seek be found. The scope before us is tremendous and one would have thought that in view of the urgency, all our resources would have been devoted to this end. Delinquency between individuals or between nations demands that we understand more fully the causes, so that we can either prevent its outbreak, or if this proves impossible, through lack of understanding, or inadequate application of that understanding, take adequate steps to deal with it when it occurs.

Along what lines then, do I think we should travel? What in, practical terms, does all the above imply? In attempting to provide the answer to these questions it is impossible to separate social welfare from international welfare, and I find we have to discover the means of organizing societies so as to enable the individual and the nation to find a place in the world, where above all else his self-respect can be retained. There must be the opportunity for peoples and nations to feel wanted to be part of the community, or of the community of nations. Individuals and nations must have the opportunity to express themselves constructively either in their day-to-day work, or in their strivings to assist the well-being of the world as a whole. There must be freedom for individualism and this demands that peoples and nations are not only brought together, but also kept apart. Only by keeping them apart can cooperation flourish. This explains why so many idealistic communities have failed. They have not failed because their ideals of brotherhood and holding all things in common have been wrong. They have failed, I suggest, because people, being human, cannot help but have weaknesses which annoy others. Families, for instance, when they grow up and marry, need to leave home and bring up their children in their own way. To demand that they remain together is asking too much of human nature. On the other hand, this does not mean that they cannot cooperate where it is to their mutual advantage to do so.

This need to cooperate based on reverence for personality, provides us, I believe, with the key to a nonviolent authority based on natural forces. By the very fact of cooperating we bring into being certain agreed procedures with which all must comply for the common good. We are still far from knowing the form this cooperaion should take, but there are many hopeful and interesting examples from which we can learn. There are more of these in agriculture than in industry, but even in an industrial country such as England, it is being discovered that from a purely economic point of view, it is important to create small units within the framework of overall planning. Such is the case with several large industrial firms such as ICI, while the political parties are all discovering the need for regional planning. All agree on the need for a central cooperating authority, although apart from the Liberals they have not gone so far as to advocate reversing the source of power from the top, i.e. to give those whose work is involved the means of controlling their own destiny. But such examples, even in industry, can be found.

Examples in agriculture or in rural areas seem to be more common and there are cooperatives in many parts of the world. These are usually formed by a number of farmers agreeing to buy and sell through one organisation. Such cooperation in Denmark has been organized to embrace most of the economic life of the country. In Denmark each small cooperative joins with neighbouring cooperatives, when some particular need arises with which the small local cooperative by itself is unable to cope. This may involve the employment of an architect to advise on the design of buildings, or an advisory officer, or the establishment of experimental stations. Other forms of cooperation are to be found in many parts of the world, and it is noteworthy that not only do the cooperatives assist in high productivity (probably because of the personal direct interest in the work) but they are also the means for reconciling age-old disputes, as is the case in

Ireland where Catholics and Protestants are sinking their differences for their mutual gain.

I have given the above illustrations because I believe it is only by following similar paths that the nations of the world can find an authority which is not tyrannical, but based on natural law as I have indicated, under which the self-respect of nations can be preserved. Authority must be accepted willingly and because it is based on justice.

Fortunately we already have many examples showing how this authority can be attained. In America, for instance, all the States cooperate under one government, yet each state retains much of its individuality. In Switzerland this idea seems to be even more pronounced, enabling many diverse and conflicting nationalities to live in peace. The Common Market extends this idea into a much larger bloc. But what is needed is not the creation of several large power blocs, with the inevitable likelihood of conflict between them, but of one world cooperative from which would arise the creation of a new world order and authority. At present we have world anarchy and it is strange that those who decry anarchy most in their own country, often seem the most active in supporting anarchy in world affairs. In this nuclear age, nations will have to learn that they can no longer remain a law unto themselves.

In this situation, the United Nations is struggling. The path it is taking is dark and uncertain, and there seems little real understanding by the people of the world about where it is going. Yet if we follow the reasoning I have attempted, then it appears to be going along in a very hopeful direction. Already it is discovering that police action is best served with a minimum of violence and that its influence really depends on the respect with which it is earned through service. The U.N., of course, is very much in its infancy, but it is an infant which has got to grow quickly to meet the needs and demands of the twentieth century. This being so, it is of the utmost importance for us to understand its basis more fully and to influence it in the right manner whenever we can.

Considerable influence is already being used to encourage positive creative acts of international cooperation. People from all walks of life, for instance, cooperated in World Refugee Year and World Development Year. Governments are increasing their help to many parts of the world, often to prevent communism or capitalism spreading, and making bilateral agreements. Such aid is misdirected because, although it may help the purpose for which it is aimed, it will fail to promote the creation of the new world order. The present trend, however, is to appreciate this fact, and the U.N. Agencies do appear to be gaining more and more recognition.

It would be easy to say that the answer can be found quite simply by redirecting the resources away from armaments towards the strengthening of these U.N. Agencies, but as we know to our cost, the obvious is prevented by many factors. The chief of these can be found in the fact that until confidence is established between nations, and there are other means available to prevent aggression, their peoples will feel they must continue to rely on their own physical defences. This dilemma can be well illustrated by the advice George Fox (the founder of Quakerism) gave to William Penn when he was asked what he should do with his sword. Instead of advising him to throw it away, he told him to keep it as long as he was able. In other words, until he had discovered a better way of solving disputes he would be advised to keep it. Similarly for the nations to disarm today without understanding an alternative way, instead of creating peace might even provoke war. Fortunately this better way is well within our grasp. The potentialities of the U.N. are very considerable and far beyond the imagination of us all. To enumerate them would be a long task and would require the assistance of many technical experts but we know enough to realize that such means of cooperation command all our support and resources. Once people learn to appreciate these potentialities and understand how they build the foundations for law and order between nations, we may hope that they will throw away their swords.

The above search for a nonviolent world authority has by its very nature involved discovering truth in many aspects, all leading to the creation of law based on natural forces.

I have compared war to disease and found that the problems which stimulate war, such as aggression, injustice and security, can be overcome without resort to violence.

This overcoming of the disease which makes for war demands new forces in the world, and I have attempted to show how these can be created through education, cooperation and service; also by discovering a new structure within which power can be contained.

It is no longer sufficient for men of goodwill, only to help each other. It is vitally necessary to create a world in which there is law and order based on justice and freedom, and consequently our most urgent task is to learn how we can realize this aim, but in a nonviolent manner, based on discovering the forces of nature expressed by Gandhi as truth-force.

SECTION SIX

BASIC PRINCIPLES OF GANDHISM

K. Santhanam

Mahatma Gandhi was an intensely active personality. He was interested in everything that concerns the individual or society. He is best known as the matchless political leader who evolved the new technique of "satyagraha". His fight against untouchability and the notions of superiority and inferiority by birth are also fairly well known. For India, his greatest service was, perhaps, the emancipation of Indian women.

It is generally known that he lived an austere life, practised strict vegetarianism and abstained from alcoholic drinks, tobacco and even the milder stimulants like coffee and tea. His attachment to simple natural remedies against illness and disease and his radical ideas on education are not so well known to the outside world and, even in India, they have not made much impact. Gandhi deliberately refrained from making these public issues and thereby confusing the people. The only exception was prohibition of intoxicating drinks which became a tool in the armoury of satyagraha. Therefore it became a plank in the Congress program; but it was well known that many an important supporter of Gandhi was privately addicted to drink and the great leader did not take undue notice of it. Even though it got into the Constitution in the form of a Directive Principle, there has been no honesty about prohibition among the Congress

Governments and Congressmen in general. Gandhi's views on language, government and economics played a considerable part in his political movements; and in the program of Khadi and Village Industries included in the Five Year Plans and in the Panchayati Raj which has recently been established, they have been accepted and implemented to some extent.

If all these ideas and activities are viewed in isolation, they constitute a miscellaneous and rather archaic collection, the importance of which will dwindle and fade away with time. It is only when it is realised that Gandhi was fundamentally a moral and social philosopher and that, through these items, he sought to experiment with certain far-reaching fundamental principles, of whose absolute truth he was convinced beyond all doubt, that their true significance becomes clear.

The first principle which guided all his thoughts and activities is the complete unity and integrity of body, mind and soul in the individual human being. He was never tired of saying that the body should be controlled by the mind and the mind by the soul. But this control is not to be achieved by despising or neglecting either the body or the mind or in the mystic exaltation of the soul by itself. He attached to physical health and well-being as much importance as to plain and logical thinking or moral responsibilty. He was one of the most logical and powerful writers; yet, he was never tired of decrying all idle and purposeless playing with words and ideas or deification of thought as such. He was convinced that real thought must be organically connected to moral purposes on the one side and useful and right action on the other.

It has been claimed that the greatest achievement of Gandhi was the spiritualisation of politics. This is undoubtedly true; but he had no faith in spirituality by itself as an abstract virtue. He conceived it as a kind of illumination or fragrance which should accompany every thought and action. It is difficult to define it, except, perhaps, through the verses of the *Bhagavad-Gita* which constituted his daily prayer.

The second principle of Gandhian philosophy may be stated as follows: All social action should be governed by the same simple set of moral values, of which the main elements are selflessness, non-attachment, nonviolence and active service. It will take me too long to define and elaborate his ideas in respect of each of these; but he believed that the growth of a man's personality is proportionate to his faith in and practice of these virtues. This is possible only when he identifies himself more and more with an ever-increasing circle till it embraces all humanity and even all living beings. He judged the value and vitality of social institutions by their capacity to foster such growth.

His third conviction was that no society, state or any other institution has any worth or importance apart from its part in contributing to the growth of the individuals of which it is composed. The State, the Nation, the community and other traditional groupings had no intrinsic value for him. In the pages of *Young India* in the earlier years, he defended the caste system as a great scheme of social and sexual discipline; but in the light of actual experience he abandoned it as an impractical system, though to the end he believed in some kind of voluntary and ideal social groups based on qualifications and capacity for service.

It was Gandhi's firm conviction that means are at least as important as, and often even more important than, ends. It is, of course, desirable that ends should be good and reasonable. But they merely give a direction to life while the means adopted constitute life itself. Therefore, if the means are right, that is, if they conform to the tests of truth and nonviolence, even mistakes, errors and failures aid the growth of the individual. On the other hand, wrong means corrupt the soul and no good can ever come out of them. Gandhi repudiated categorically the idea that ends justify the means. This implies the rejection of war, espionage and crooked diplomacy, even when they are adopted for the so-called noble ends of defending the country, religion or humanity.

Faith in God is, according to Gandhi, the foundation of all moral values. He never defined God and was prepared to allow every person to have his own idea of God. For himself, he was inclined to think of Him as the Upanishadic Brahman. But, so long as a person believes in some source of spiritual life and holds it superior to the material universe, he is a believer in God.

Gandhi had no objection even to a formal profession of agnosticism, so long as a person demonstrated by his attachment to moral values that this outlook was essentially spiritual in essence.

I believe that the influence of Gandhi in the future will depend more and more on the realisation that these fundamental principles constitute the core of his teachings and that all his actions were merely illustrations of their application. He considered his life as a series of experiments with truth. Therefore, it is his conception of truth that is central to his life and work. I do not claim that the principles I have indicated exhaust his conception; but I believe that they constitute its basic elements.

THE IDEAL AND THE ACTUAL IN GANDHI'S PHILOSOPHY

B. S. Sharma

The question: "How is the ideal related to and distinct from the actual?" is crucial to the understanding of Gandhi's philosophy. The failure to appreciate this has led his critics either to misrepresent him or to call him inconsistent and full of contradictions. Gandhi has often been quoted against himself. Dr Bondurant writes: "Gandhi's political philosophy is, indeed, elusive. To the scholar who seeks internally consistent, systematised bodies of thought, the study of Gandhi is unrewarding."[1] She attributes this to the "result of his thinking in public".[2] Another recent writer, Dr Paul F. Power, writes: "Divergent and sometimes conflicting positions can be traced throughout most of his public life, although one may dominate the others during particular phases."[3] He tries to classify Gandhi's idea into different categories at different times and concludes that they "cut across".[4] At the same time, later on he observes: "And if one of Gandhi's characteristics was rigid adherence to principle, another, equally notable, was his capacity of adaptation to people and circumstances." But how he made this "adaptation to people and circumstances" is not explained. To Mr Hiren Mukerjee, an Indian communist, Gandhi was a Utopian "running what he imagined were model settlements".[5] There are, however, others who think differently. Professor Morris-Jones observes: "The wonder begins to be that over a half century of social change, over a number of diverse situations, so much consistency should remain."[6] Professor Tinker writes: "Few political leaders have been so fundamentally consistent as Gandhi, with a consistency impossible of achievement."[7]

Gandhi, it is true, was not concerned with constructing a system of philosophy, but mainly with applying the ideals and principles that had become a part of his life. Therefore, we do not find the distinction between the ideal and the actual explicitly stated. One discovers this only when studying his ideas in the context of his background, which was essentially that of Hindu philosophy. Cut off from this source, his ideas sometimes produce the impression of inconsistency; read in the context, they form a coherent whole. He may, therefore, not appear to be consistent with his previous statements, but he is, in his own words, consistent with truth as it may present itself at a given moment. He explains it further: "Whenever I have been obliged to compare my writing even fifty years ago with the latest, I have discovered no inconsistency between the two. But friends who observe inconsistency . . . should try to see if there is not an underlying and abiding consistency between the two seeming inconsistencies."[8]

Although for understanding Gandhi's philosophy it is necessary that the concepts be understood in the context of Hindu philosophy, it is equally important to bear in mind that Gandhi's connotations of terms are different from the prevalent ones. Quite often they sound national or geographical, when in fact they are universal. He never seems to have realised that this could sometimes have the effect of damaging his own purpose.[9]

The ultimate ideal for Gandhi, as he repeated several times, is unrealised and unrealisable; its value consists in pointing out the direction. According to him, there must always be an unbridgeable gulf between the ideal and its practice. The ideal will cease to be one if it becomes possible to realise it. He argues: "Where would there be room for that constant striving, that ceaseless quest after the ideal that is the basis of all spiritual progress, if mortals could reach the perfect state while still in the body?" Striving after the ideal is the very essence of practising Gandhi's philosophy. To the extent we make this effort, to that extent we realise the ideal.

Two basic principles, Truth and Nonviolence, are the foundations of Gandhi's philosophy. At the highest level of experience they merge and become one with God. The ideal of reality is also the ideal of value—a distinctive mark of Hindu philosophy. God, therefore, has been referred to by Gandhi as Truth or Love (nonviolence in its perfection). His ideal of life, self-realisation, therefore, is couched in ideal terms, when the Unity of Man and God has also been achieved. Gandhi, however, is fully aware that in actual fact, at the present level of human experience, there is a gulf between man and God; indeed, this gulf will never be completely bridged as long as we are in this body. "Being necessarily limited by the bonds of flesh we can achieve perfection only after the dissolution of the body." But while in this body, the gulf can certainly be narrowed. Thus recognising the imperfect nature of man, Gandhi's prescription would be to follow the relative truth persistently which he called "satyagraha". This shows the dynamic character of his ideas.

In order to achieve this ideal, he prescribed an ethical discipline—the observance of vows which he defined as "doing at any cost something that one ought to do". But taking of a vow does not mean that we are able to observe it completely from the very beginning, but it does mean "constant and honest effort in thought, word and deed, with a view to its fulfilment". It is no doubt true that in this way the practice of the ideal becomes very slippery indeed—anything could be justified as following the ideal. But this is unavoidable as is the fate of all ethical ideals whose observance can hardly be a matter of strict objective scrutiny; it would ultimately depend on the spirit of the person who observes it and which no outsider can determine fully. At the same time, it does not condone the moral lapses of the individual; rather, this consciousness should make one strive to overcome the imperfections.

Gandhi's adoption of nonviolence as a method of pursuing truth is due to the fact that man, imperfect as he is, can only strive, he cannot command the result. Perfect nonviolence, being the attribute of God alone, cannot be practised by human beings.

Being a part of society, man cannot but participate in "himsa" that the very existence of society involves. Gandhi, therefore, would consider a person true to his faith if "there is an effort to avoid the violence that is inevitable in life". That is how Gandhi's ideal of nonviolence is translated into actual practice. In essence, it consists "in allowing others the maximum of convenience at the maximum inconvenience to us, even at the risk of life. Everyone has to determine for himself the amount of inconvenience he is capable of putting up with. No third party can determine it for him." Gandhi believed that one should rather be conscious of one's imperfections than that one should lower one's ideal; this would spur the individual to perfect himself.

The application of nonviolence and satyagraha to social and political fields has been a subject of great controversy. So complete was Gandhi's faith that he considered it a remedy against all social evils. What makes it a unique method of bringing about change is the transformation of the whole atmosphere, satyagrahi and the opponent included. Its success or failure is not to be judged in terms of victory or defeat of one party but in terms of a change of heart of both. It is not merely a form of persuasion which is aimed in one direction only. If, in spite of the best efforts of the satyagrahi, some moral coercion is felt by the opponent, then such coercion is unavoidable because of the imperfect nature of the satyagrahi. However, he is obliged to try his best to reduce this unavoidable coercion to the minimum. That alone would make it different from passive resistance.

Ideally not even a group organisation is necessary. "A man or woman who is saturated with ahimsa has only to will a thing and it happens." This is because a perfect satyagrahi would be nearer to God; and what is beyond His power! Since such a perfect satyagrahi is not available, Gandhi realised the necessity of group action. Also satyagraha has its educative purpose, which is to bring about confidence in the community. Gandhi's method strongly emphasises the need of ethical discipline, whose essential ingredient is courage—the courage of dying without killing. Having decided upon the rightness of a situation, Gandhi would not like one to be a passive spectator to evil. That would be participation in the evil itself. If one *does not have sufficient* *nonviolence* to die without killing one should not shamefully flee from the danger in the name of nonviolence. Rather, Gandhi would advise killing and being killed. While for himself he did not believe in the use of arms at all, he would not hesitate to advise their use by those who had no faith in nonviolence. "If there was a national government, whilst I should not take any direct part in any war, I can conceive occasions when it would be my duty to vote for the military training of those who wish to take it. For I know that all its members do not believe in nonviolence to the extent I do. It is not possible to make a person or a society nonviolent by compulsion." Under certain circumstances, nonviolence may be only a matter of policy, as it was with the Indian National Congress. But this cannot be identified with the level of nonviolence which Gandhi personally was capable of. There is not a uniform pattern of application of nonviolence for all individuals and societies. Gandhi is sometimes talking in terms of the ideal, sometimes from his personal level; and sometimes from the point of view of what he considered the Indian masses were capable of doing. It is this distinction, which is not always made explicit, that gives the impression of inconsistency.

Sometimes a confusion is made between the acts of the individual and those of the State, and it is expected that Gandhi's State is to be nonviolent. But how is the State to act nonviolently, when for Gandhi it "represents violence in a concentrated and organised form"? Indeed a nonviolent State is a contradiction in terms. Ultimately, when nonviolence is the governing principle of society, we could not call it a State—it could only be called a nonviolent stateless society. And that is the ideal for Gandhi.

In such a society people would simply grow accustomed spontaneously to observe their social obligations without the operation of the state. The necessity of legal enforcement arises because of human imperfections. The more the individuals have imbibed the spirit of nonviolence, the less the necessity of the state. This is the implication of Gandhi's concept of Swaraj. "The attempt to win Swaraj is Swaraj itself." It is a developing ideal and is "better than the best". Gandhi calls it "indefinable". In the context of the Indian National Movement, he said that Swaraj did not mean merely political independence but "many other things". A Western style of parliamentary government he would accept as Swaraj for the time being only. While in the ideal society there is no room for the military and the police, yet in the actual State there is provision for it according to the moral level of its citizens. That is to say, a predominantly nonviolent State is the practical possibility and is the second best ideal of Gandhi. Failure to recognise the levels in Gandhi's thought results in such confused statements as this : "It is indeed clear that Gandhi held essential ideals in common with anarchists, that he was willing, as they are not, to accept a degree of state organisation and control. He believed that government to be best which governs least, and yet he held that 'there are certain things which cannot be done without political power', even though there are 'numerous other things which do not at all depend upon political power'. . . . It would, of course, be incorrect to suppose that Gandhi thought of retaining the state as some intermediate step in a determined progress towards anarchical society."[10]

Gandhi's actual State does concede the desirability of using the military and the police to deal with anti-social elements and defend the country. What, however, distinguishes his approach is the admission of weakness not of the doctrine of nonviolence or of satyagraha, but of the individuals who practise it. Whatever political institutions Gandhi accepted, he did so only as a transitional device, to be transcended by better ones. No institutional device is final. They must evolve with the evolution of individuals. In actual practice, it would be a mixture: "A government cannot succeed in becoming entirely nonviolent because it represents all the people." He expected that the national policy would incline towards militarism of a modified character.

While fighting for the independence of India, Gandhi was conscious all the time of the necessity of moral uplift of the individuals who are to work the institutions after independence. In directing his energies towards political reform his method was equally directed "to educating the individuals to rise to a moral stature". He says : "Responsible government, which is a gift without the will and power of the people behind it, will be a mere paper responsibility hardly worth the paper on which it may be printed. If it is a fact that the atmosphere for immediate self-government among the states is not propitious, and the people are not ready to pay the price, it follows that they should have the proper training."

When, therefore, Gandhi is criticised as a politician, such criticism is mainly based on his having one end in view, viz. the national independence of India; it ignores the other important principle of Gandhi, namely the moral training of the individual.

In the economic field, Gandhi holds to the ideal of Trusteeship. Ultimately he subscribes to "non-possession". But in actual life he admits that some possession is unavoidable for the maintenance of the body and its needs so that it may be used for performing its duties. But property must always be held as a trust for the people and must satisfy this instrumental character. While absolute trusteeship is no doubt an abstraction and is unattainable, like Euclid's point, an effort in this direction will remove the hardships of inequality. In the actual world, Gandhi would not even mind State regulation, but with the minimum use of power—by which he means constitutional machinery. He goes to the length of saying: "Every vested interest must be subjected to scrutiny and confiscation ordered where necessary—with or without compensation, as the case may be." This is what he said in 1932 at the Round Table Conference in London. As a part of a civil disobedience movement in 1942 he could expect "the peasants to stop taxes" and even "to seize the land". But this was not a matter of "advance", as Mr Mukerji terms it;[11] nor "a signal change in Gandhi's ideology" as "dictated by politics"[12]; it was indeed the application of his philosophy of property when trusteeship had failed.

Gandhi never failed to emphasise the need for his ideals which sometimes even seem to blur the distinction between the ideal and the actual. He talked of independent India adopting —with qualifications—the satyagraha technique against aggression if India could acquire enough nonviolence. He knew very well that the people of India did not have nonviolence of his standard even to expel the British government: why then did he continue to talk of repelling armed aggression nonviolently? For

Gandhi, nonviolence was not merely a weapon to achieve self-government: for once independence was achieved, a constant effort was to be made to reach the ideal when it would, of course, be possible to defend the country nonviolently. Such an ideal, it is true, was not to be realised immediately after the British government withdrew, but was to be striven for.

To conclude: Gandhi's philosophy lays down moral ideals for individuals and groups to strive for—their value consists in pointing out the direction, not in their realisation. They cannot be enforced from above but depend upon their voluntary acceptance. Unavoidable use of force he considers to be a necessary evil—but an evil all the same. The extent to which these ideals can be practised depends on the ethical capacity of individuals or groups. Accordingly, the actual practice of these ideals cannot be uniform. As a social and political reformer, Gandhi spoke from different levels at different times. But three levels mainly dominate his writings: first, that of the perfect ideal (unrealisable); second, that of his own personal point of view (admitting himself to be far from perfect, yet sufficiently advanced to practise his ideals); third, that of the point of view of the Indian masses. Yet what is implied throughout is this: that even though the ideal may be impossible of attainment, the very act of pursuing it generates the good-will essential for the well-being of the corporate life.

---

1. *Conquest of Violence* (1958), p. 147.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 7.
3. *Gandhi on World Affairs* (1960), p. 35.
4. *Ibid.*
5. *Gandhiji—A Study* (1958), p. 32.
6. "Mahatma Gandhi—Political Philosopher?" in *Political Studies*, February 1960.
7. "Magnificent Failure?" in *International Affairs*, April 1964.
8. Tendulkar, *Mahatma*, Vol. V., p, 206.
9. For example, he expressed his picture of independent India as "Ram Raj" which he explained and meant as "the rule based on moral authority". In spite of his explanation that by "Ram Raj" he did not mean Hindu Raj but "the kingdom of God", the God of truth and righteousness, it never failed to

arouse the fear of orthodox Muslims that Gandhi meant to establish a Hindu Raj. Perhaps, for a man so thoroughly steeped in Hindu philosophy, a different vocabulary was not possible.

10. Bondurant, *op. cit.*, p. 183.
11. *Op. cit.*, p. 148.
12. Paul F. Power, *op. cit.*, p. 41.

MEANS AND ENDS IN POLITICS

Raghawan N. Iyer

Most political and social thinkers have been concerned with the desirable (and even necessary) goals of a political system or with the common and competing ends that men actually desire, and then pragmatically considered the means that are available to rulers and citizens. Even those who have sought a single, general, and decisive criterion of decision-making have stated the ends and then been more concerned with the consequences of social and political acts than with consistently applying standards of intrinsic value. It has become almost a sacred dogma in our age of apathy that politics, centred on power and conflict and the quest for legitimacy and consensus, is essentially a study in expediency, a tortuous discovery of practical expedients that could reconcile contrary claims and secure a common if minimal goal or, at least, create the conditions in which different ends could be freely or collectively pursued. Liberal thinkers have sought to show that it is possible for each individual to be used as a means for another to achieve his ends without undue coercion and to his own distinct advantage. This occurs not by conscious cooperation or deliberately pursuing a common end but by each man pursuing diverse ends in accordance with the "law" of the natural identity of interests, a "law" that is justified if not guaranteed in terms of metaphysical or economic or biological "truths". Authoritarian thinkers, on the other hand, justified coercion in the name of a pre-determined common end, the attainment of which cannot be left to the chaotic interplay of innumerable wills. The end may simply be the preservation of a traditional order, or the recovery of a bygone age of glory, or the ruthless reconstruction of society from the top to secure some spectacular consummation in the future.

It appears to be common to most schools of thought to accept a sharp dichotomy between ends and means, a distinction that is deeply embedded in our ethical and political and psychological vocabulary, rooted in rigid European pre-suppositions regarding the very nature of human action. Distinctions have been repeatedly made between immediate and ultimate, short-term and long-term, diverse and common, individual and social, essential and desirable ends, as also between attainable and utopian goals. Discussion about means has not ignored questions about their moral implications and propriety or about the extent of their theoretical and contingent compatibility with desired ends or widely shared values. But despite all these reservations, the dangerous dogma that the end entirely justifies the means is merely an extreme version of the commonly uncriticised belief that moral considerations cannot apply to the means except in relation to ends, or that the latter have a moral priority.

Gandhi seems to stand almost alone among social and political thinkers in his firm rejection of the rigid dichotomy between ends and means and in his extreme moral preoccupation with the means to the extent that they rather than the ends provide the standard of reference. He was led to this position by his early acceptance of satya and ahimsa, truth and nonviolence, as twin moral absolutes and his consistent view of their relationship. In *Hind Swaraj* he wrote that even great men who have been considered religious have committed grievous crimes through the mistaken belief that there is no moral connection or interdependence between the means and the end. We cannot get a rose through planting a noxious weed. "The means may be likened to a seed, the end to a tree; and there is just the same inviolable connection between the means and the end as there is between the seed and the tree."[1]

It is not as though violence and nonviolence are merely different means to secure the same end. As they are morally different in quality and essence, they must necessarily achieve different results. The customary dichotomy between means and ends originates in, and reinforces, the view that they are two entirely different categories of action and that their relationship is mainly a technical matter to be settled by considering what will be effective and what is possible in a given situation, that the ethical problem of choice requires an initial decision regarding the desired end and the obligatory acceptance of whatever steps seem necessary to secure it or are most likely to do so. Gandhi, however, was led by his metaphysical belief in the "law" of karma —the "law" of ethical causation or moral retribution that links all the acts of interdependent individuals—to the view that the relationship between means and ends is organic, the moral quality of the latter being causally dependent upon that of the former. The psychology of human action in a morally indivisible community of apparently isolated units demands that the means-end relationship must be seen in terms of the consistent growth in moral awareness of individuals and communities and not in relation to the mechanical division of time into arbitrary and discrete intervals. If for Gandhi there was no "wall of separation" between means and end, this was because of his basic belief that in politics as in all spheres of human action we reap exactly what we sow.

Gandhi's view of the means-end relationship may be put in the form of the following statements, which overlap and yet express several distinct ideas: "For me it is enough to know the means. Means and end are convertible terms in my philosophy of life."[2] "We have always control over the means but not over the end."[3] "I feel that our progress towards the goal will be in exact proportion to the purity of our means."[4] "They say 'means are after all means'. I would say 'means are after all everything'. As the means so the end."[5]

The first statement rejects the notion that in our actual conduct we can make a firm and decisive distinction between means and ends. Gandhi's conception of the psychology of human action requires this rejection of a conventional conceptual habit which makes us ascribe to ourselves greater knowledge, and greater assurance, than we actually possess. The second statement asserts a contingent truth about the extent andthe limit of our free will, that the individual's capacity to determine what he can do in any specific situation at any given time is much greater than his power of anticipation, prediction and control over the consequences of his actions. The third statement expresses the metaphysical belief in the moral law of karma, under which there is an exact causal connection between the extent of the moral "purity" (detachment and disinterestedness or the degree of moral awareness) of an act and the measure of individual effectiveness in promoting or pursuing and securing a morally worthy end, over a period of time. Clearly, this metaphysical belief cannot be conclusively verified or falsified by evidence. The fourth statement is a practical recommendation that we must be primarily or even wholly concerned with the immediate adoption of what we regard as a morally worthy (i.e. intrinsically justifiable) means. This recommendation may be accepted by those who subscribe to the second statement and it is mandatory for those who share the metaphysical belief implicit in the third statement.

The closest approximation to Gandhi's view of the means-end relationship is that of Jacques Maritain, who regards the problem of End and Means as the basic problem in political philosophy. There are two opposite ways of understanding the "rationalization of political life". There is the easier way of "technical rationalization" through means external to man, versus the more exacting way of "moral rationalization" through means which are man himself, his freedom and virtue. It is a universal and inviolable axiom for Maritain, an obvious primary principle, that "means must be proportioned and appropriate to the end, since they are ways to the end and, so to speak, the end itself in its very process of coming into existence. So that applying intrinsically evil means to attain an intrinsically good end is simply nonsense and a blunder."[6]

If Maritain and Gandhi have no use for the "easier way of technical rationalization" or for piecemeal "social engineering", this is not merely because of their rejection of an utilitarian in favour of an absolutist (or non-naturalistic) ethic, but also because of their daringly unorthodox repudiation of the so-called pragmatist view of politics and the dominant doctrine of "double standards" which requires a sharp separation between the moral consideration applicable to individual conduct and those (if any) regarded as relevant to political action.

Gandhi's view of the morally legitimate means to be exclusively employed in furthering political ends was deeply affected by the doctrine of dispassionate action in the *Gita.*[7] He was convinced that an intense concentration upon the task at hand can and must be combined with a degree of detachment, a freedom from anxiety about the future consequences. If we are sure of the "purity" of the means we employ, we shall be led on by faith, before which "all fear and trembling melt away".[8] Unconcern with results does not mean that we need not have a clear conception of the end in view. But while the cause has to be just and clear as well as the means,[9] it is even more important to recognise that "impure" means must result in an "impure" end,[10] that we cannot attain to any truth through untruthful means, that we cannot secure justice through unjust means, or freedom through tyrannical acts, or socialism through enmity and coercion, or enduring peace through war. The man who wields force does not scruple about the means and yet foolishly imagines that this will make no difference to the end he seeks. Gandhi explicitly rejected the doctrine that the end justifies the means,[11] and went so far as to assert that a moral means is almost an end in itself because virtue is its own reward.[12]

The doctrine that the end justifies the means goes back to Kautilya in India and to Machiavelli in the West, and is connected with the notions of self-preservation at all costs and of raison d'etre and in more recent times with the attainment of a secular millenium through revolutionary action. The doctrine was implicit in *Killing No Murder*, Colonel Sexby's incitement to political assassination published in 1657. This once famous pamphlet argued that tyrants accomplish their end much more by fraud than by force and that if they are not eliminated by force the citizens would be degraded into deceitful, perfidious flatterers. It is not only "lawful" and even glorious to kill a tyrant, but indeed "everything is lawful against him that is lawful against an open enemy, whom every private man hath a right to kill". It is no doubt possible to justify tyrannicide without going so far as to say that a worthy end legitimizes any and every means. The difficulty, however, is that few practitioners would admit to holding to this maxim in an unqualified and unconditional form.

It has been argued repeatedly that any means is legitimate that is indispensable at least for internal security or to defend society against its external enemies. The sole reason for restricting the choice of means is expediency rather than principle, prudence rather than (non-utilitarian) morality. It is taken for granted that cunning and force must unite in the exercise of power. Power may be justified as a means to a higher end but in the attempt to employ any and every means to secure and maintain power it becomes an end itself. The idea that one is serving some higher entity which rises far above individual life and that one is no longer serving oneself makes one no less indifferent to the morality of the means employed than the open pursuit of naked self-interest. Alternatively, we have the straightforward Machiavellian notion that the individual agent cannot escape the nature he is born with, that as *fortuna* is malicious so *virtu* must also be malicious when there is no other way open. If *virtu* is the vital power in men which creates and maintains States, *necessita* is the causal pressure required to bring the sluggish masses into line with *virtu*. If there is a moral law, it must be flouted in the practice of politics and this infringement can be justified by the plea of unavoidable necessity. This line of reasoning is commoner than we like to think and is sometimes couched in such specious or emotive language that in moments of crisis many people are hardly aware of the wider implications of a doctrine that they invoke for their special pleading in what seem to be exceptional situations. Hume thought that this doctrine was so widely practised that it is safer in politics to assume that men are scoundrels even if we do not believe that all men are knaves.

It is true that thinkers like Machiavelli and Bentham have been rather unfairly accused of actually holding that there is an end justifying all means to it. Bentham said only that happiness is the end justifying all means, which is more an empty than a pernicious doctrine. Again, Machiavelli never said that power justifies all means to it, but merely that the gaining of power often involves committing some very nasty crimes. A similar defence could also be made on behalf of Kautilya. The important point, however, is not the precise standpoints of Bentham, Machiavelli or Kautilya, but the dangerous uses to which their doctrines could be put. Just as Benthamites, Machiavellians and followers of Kautilya could be charged with ruthlessness (even more than their teachers), so too Gandhians also could be accused of coercive tactics ("nonviolent" only in a very restricted sense) in the pursuit of worthy ends. But it would be much easier to challenge such Gandhians in terms of Gandhi's fundamental tenets than to appeal to the writings of Machiavelli or Bentham against diehard Machiavellians or Benthamite planners.

The doctrine that the end justifies the means does not even require any special justification for the Marxist who accepted no supra-historic morality, no categorical imperative, religious or secular. Engels declared in his letter to Herson Trier in 1889 that "any means that leads to the aim suits me as a revolutionary, whether it is the most violent or that which appears to be most peaceable". In his pamphlet on *Socialism and War* Lenin said that Marxists differed both from pacifists and anarchists in their belief that the justification of each war must be seen individually in relation to its historical role and its consequences. "There have been many wars in history which, notwithstanding all the horrors, cruelties, miseries and tortures inevitably connected with every war, have a progressive character, i.e. they served in the development of mankind, aiding in the destruction of extremely pernicious and reactionary institutions . . . . or helping to remove the most barbarous despotism in Europe." Whether an action is justifiable or not simply depends on what historical end it serves.

Unlike Engels and Lenin, Trotsky stressed what he called the dialectical interdependence of means and ends. He argued that the means chosen must be shown to be really likely to lead to the liberation of mankind. "Precisely from this it follows that not all means are permissible. When we say that the end justifies the means then for us the conclusion follows that the great revolutionary end spurns those base means and ways which set one part of the working class against other parts, or attempt to make the masses happy without their participation; or lower the faith of the masses in themselves and their organisation, replacing it by worship of the leaders" (*Their Morals and Ours*). This is clearly an improvement on Lenin, for it at least provides a criterion by which a collectivist regime or revolutionary leaders could be criticised for pushing an exclusively utilitarian creed to extremes of practical ruthlessness in perpetuating a monopoly of power and privilege.

Although Trotsky denied that the end justifies any and every means, he still insisted that a means can be justified only by its end, which for him is the increase of the power of man over nature and the abolition of the power of man over man. For Gandhi, on the other hand, the end is satya or truth, which requires no justification, and the means (ahimsa or non-coercion) must be justified not merely with reference to the end but also in itself; every act must be independently justified in terms of the twin absolutes, satya and ahimsa. It is, therefore, not permissible or possible to justify a single act of untruth or violence by appealing to the past or future possession of satya and ahimsa, though no man can wholly avoid a measure of himsa or asatya or claim to possess in their fullness absolute truth and absolute, universal love. Weakness and error are ubiquitous and inescapable, but their justification and rationalization make all the difference to our personal and political integrity. We cannot condone our untruthfulness in the present on the ground that we shall be truthful tomorrow when we are stronger or conditions are more favourable. A violent revolution cannot lead (and, in any case, cannot be justified on the ground that it is expected to lead) to a nonviolent society in the fullness of time. Further, in Gandhi's view it is not sometimes, as Trotsky suggested, but *always* (under the moral law of karma) that the end changes in character as a result of the means adopted in its attainment.

If the doctrine that the end justifies the means is invoked in the attainment of the good society through a single, violent revolution, it could also be made to justify repression in the aftermath of revolution.

In Abram Tertz's *The Trial Begins* we have the following dialogue between Rabinovich and Globov. Rabinovich holds that "every decent End consumes itself. You kill yourself trying to reach it and by the time you get there, it's been turned inside out. These Jesuits of yours made a miscalculation, they slipped up." Globov answers: "They were right. Every educated person knows that the end justifies the means. You can either believe it openly or secretly but you can't get anywhere without it. If the enemy does not surrender, he must be destroyed. Isn't that so? And since all means are good, you must choose the most effective. Don't spare God himself in the name of God. . . . And as soon as one End is done with, another bobs up on the stage of history."

Similarly, when Rubashov in *Darkness at Noon* points out that violence starts a chain of cumulative consequences, Ivanov replies that no battalion commander can stick to the principle that the individual is sacrosanct, that the world has permanently been in an abnormal state since the invention of the steam engine and that the principle that the end justifies the means remains the only rule of practical ethics. It is ironical that while this doctrine is increasingly taken for granted by some Benthamite planners and Kautilyan diplomats in Gandhi's India, it has been openly questioned even in the most powerful society that has adopted Marxism as a State religion. The Russian poet, Yevgeny Yevtushenko, has stated, in a remarkable article, that Stalin was forgiven much in his lifetime because Soviet citizens were led to think that his acts were necessary for some higher purpose. "They steadily impressed upon us that the end justified the means. A great pain gives birth to a great 'flow of energy', as Stalin once declared. But even as we lamented him, many of us recalled our kin and our friends who had perished in the prisons. Naturally, to lock up such an enormous number of people required a truly prodigious amount of 'energy'. But people did not ponder on the fact that the aim itself may cease to be great, if one strives after it only with great energy and without paying much attention to the means. We realised that the means must be worthy of the end. This is an axiom, but an axiom that has been proved through much suffering."

Gandhi's way of combating the doctrine that the end justifies the means was by asserting not merely that unworthy means could belittle a great end but also that evil means can never, as a matter of fact, lead to good ends. Like the majority of Russian Populists, Gandhi was horrified by the advocacy of Machiavellian tactics and he thought that no end, however good, could fail to be destroyed by the adoption of monstrous means. His reason for believing this to be wholly and always true was his metaphysical conviction that the whole world is governed by the law of karma, that there is a moral order (rita) at the heart of the cosmos. Those who do not share this conviction, which is common to all the great religions and is especially prevalent in peasant societies, may well think that a lesser evil could lead to a greater good. This latter belief, which is no less non-empirical than the former, is taken for granted by many contemporary intellectuals, powerholders, leaders of organizations and evangelists (whether theological teleologists or secular historicists). It is hardly surprising that Gandhi who even earlier than Benda recognised the betrayal of and alienation from the masses of narrowly based classes of intellectuals and power-seekers, appealed over their heads to the toiling masses to find recruits willing to dedicate themselves to the Constructive Programme and the development of a new social and political ethic.

Gandhi did more than base his view of ends and means on a metaphysical faith in the moral law or his account of the necessary as well as contingent connection between satya and ahimsa. truth and nonviolence, tolerance and civility. He also rejected the moral model underlying the sharp dichotomy between ends and means. Moral life was not for Gandhi mainly a matter of achieving specific objectives, nor was politics like a field game in which a concrete objective is given in advance and known to all. No doubt, he regarded satya as the supreme common end for all men but its content cannot be known in advance. For Gandhi, as for the ancient Greeks, satya refers to the highest human activity rather than an imposed and pre-determined target. He evolved his political and social ethic in terms of a theory of action under which all our thinking and activity can be corrected and justified only by reference to satya and ahimsa, which are good in themselves and not merely the means to a higher good. It is only for the sake of these goods—in order that as much of them as possible may at some time exist—that anyone can be justified in undertaking any social or political activity. They are the raison d'etre of virtue and excellence, the ultimate test of human endeavour, the sole criterion of social progress.

In stating that Gandhi rejected the sharp dichotomy between ends and means, it is obviously not suggested that the distinction is entirely false and useless. Surely, everyone (including Gandhi) would agree that it is often possible to distinguish between ends and means, and also useful to do so. The distinction is most easily made when we are considering some particular purpose that a man might have in mind before embarking on a specific action. But if, like Bentham, we say that what a man wants is to get or to maximise "happiness" then it becomes much more difficult to make a clear distinction between the end (the greatest happiness) and all the various things said to be means to it. For a man's conception of happiness depends largely upon his desiring the things said to be means to it. It happens to be true that the things usually held up as supreme ends of human endeavour (happiness, freedom, welfare, etc.) are empty notions, apart from the things said tobe means to them. We mustdistinguish between men's goals and their principles, the rules they accept. Sometimes, of course, their goal is to inculcate a principle or to observe it themselves or get others to do so, but they have many other goals. But it seems to be more realistic to think of men as having a variety of goals, some of which matter more than others, than to think of them as having a supreme goal to which all others are subordinate, either as means to it or being willingly sacrificed whenever they conflict with it. The distinction between ends and means becomes misleading and dangerous when we dogmatize that there is a single supreme good or even a fixed hierarchy of goodness.

Gandhi did not lay down the law for all men or impose on nature a rigid, teleological pattern of his own. He merely argued from the proposition that all men have some idea of truth (satya) but no adequate conception of Absolute Truth (sat) to the prescription that society should regard the pursuit of satya as a common end. He further pointed out that in seeking the truth, we cannot help being true to our "real" natures (identical with that of all others) and this means exemplifying a measure of nonviolence in our attitudes and relations towards others. It is possible (though questionable) for people to argue that the unhappiness of some is required to maximize collective happiness, that individual citizens have to be coerced for the sake of general freedom, that the maintenance of public virtue sometimes requires subjects to choose (or support) privately corrupt but efficient and outwardly respectable rulers. It would, however, be difficult to contend that the collective pursuit of truth is compatible with the adoption of dishonest devices or the condoning of untruth. This could be advanced if a pre-ordained, collectivist conception of truth is imposed on the members of a society. A dogmatic ideology may be propagated by dishonest and ruthless methods.

Gandhi explicitly believed that no person or group could speak in the name of sat or Absolute Truth for the very reason that all are entitled to their relative truths, to satya as it appears to different people. As truth in this conception is identical with integrity (fidelity to one's own conscience), Gandhi could claim that no man can pursue greater integrity as an end by adopting means involving a sacrifice of the integrity he already has. The test of one's immediate moral integrity is nonviolence, it is a test of one's genuineness in the pursuit of truth (i.e. of intellectual integrity) through one's actions in the midst of society. If we understand the concept of satya and accept its pursuit as a common end, we cannot make a hard-and-fast distinction between this end and the means towards it that we employ. On the other hand, it is particularly if we regard the promotion of happiness as the whole duty of man that we become careless about the means and violate the "laws of morality". "The consequences of this line of thinking are writ large on the history of Europe", said Gandhi in his introduction to his paraphrase of Ruskin's *Unto This Last*. For Gandhi the *polis* is nothing more or less than the domain in which all men are free to gain skill in the art of action and learn how to exemplify satya and ahimsa; the arena in which both the individual quest could be furthered and the social virtues displayed among the masses of citizens in a climate of tolerance and civility; a morally progressive society in which neither the State nor any social organization is allowed to flout with impunity the sacred principle that every man is entitled to his relative truth and no one can claim the right to coerce another, to treat him as a means to his own end.

1. *Hind Swaraj*, p. 115.
2. *Young India*, December 1924.
3. D.G. Tendulkar, *Mahatma*, Volume 5 (1st edition), p. 366.
4. *Ibid.*, p. 256.
5. *Harijan*, February 1937.
6. *Man and the State*, p. 55.
7. See Edwyn Bevan's comparison between the *Gita* and Stoicism in *Stoics and Sceptics*.
8. *Harijan*, February 1937.
9. D.G. Tendulkar, *Mahatma*, Volume 7, p. 204.
10. *Harijan*, July 1947.
11. D.G. Tendulkar, *ibid*, p. 254.
12. Letter to Carl Heath, January 1941.

A CONTEMPORARY INTERPRETATION OF AHIMSA

Agehananda Bharati

If Indian intellects suffer from any endemic trouble, I believe it is a systematic confusion between the "is" and the "ought". Statements which illustrate this confusion abound in modern Indian parlance: "There is no caste in modern Hinduism"; "Indian culture is more spiritual than Western culture"; and, directly concerning our theme, "Ahimsa is the supreme law". In all these statements, token statements of Indian culture at various times, or in a continuum carrying into our day, the "is" should be replaced by, or should have been avoided in the first place *and* substituted by "ought". I have heard a common rejoinder to this suggestion: it is not a systematic confusion, but ignorance—so say the modest; or better intuition of the Truth (the capital letter is *heard* whenever it is used in a rejoinder)—so say the pompous. But whether ignorance or some sort of non-cognitive, superior intuition, the philosophical fact is and remains that no "ought" ever follows from an "is", nor does an "is" ever imply an "ought"—the two refer to two worlds that cannot meet; or, less Kiplingian, these are two languages which cannot be used together; or again, more technically, "is" and "ought" belong to different, incompatible logical categories. It may one day be the case that there is no caste in India, and it may always have been the case that ahimsa was the supreme law, if this could be proved axiomatically; or it may be the case that there ought to be no caste in India, and that ahimsa ought to be the supreme moral law—but these are two totally unrelated types of statement; they are four different statements, not two.

I am proceeding on the assumption that ahimsa ought to be the supreme law; "supreme" both in an aggregative sense, as the law that should stand on top of any legal and/or moral hierarchy, and in a universal sense, that it should be binding for all societies at all times and in all circumstances. This may be denied, of course, but then we would not have a topic—it would peter out and this article could not be written. Given, however, that an audience does accept the ruling, I will urge for a new, restrictive, but valid definition of ahimsa, and will try to show that it works in a universal setting which is both humane and sophisticated, yet not sanctimonious, nor pompous or trivial.

The genesis of ahimsa as a moral precept is not, as most people in India and their Western admirers have come to think, Buddhist or Jain. The dictum, "*ahimsa paramo dharmah*" (nonviolence is the supreme dharma) is a quotation from the *Mahabharata*, and Yudhisthira is the speaker. When asked what he regarded as moral law (this, of course, is a very general and perhaps a scurrilous rendition of niti, dharma, niyama and other loaded terms), he gives a lengthy disquisition on what people of different social status, and in different, i.e. geographically diversified, societies ought to do and to omit—a rather more prolix summary of the svadharma teachings hinted at in the *Gita* in another portion of the epic. But when the questioner persists, the King finally comes out with his *obiter dictum* for all times: "*Ahimsa paramo dharmah*". Translated into modern parlance this simply means: all rules of action, religious, secular, moral are subject to the societies in which they apply, and are specific to the social status and to the roles played within any particular social setting. The only rule that applies to all societies, at all times, and in the acting of any social role and in any status, is that of ahimsa, for which I retain the Gandhian translation of "nonviolence" without any critical qualm. "Nonviolence" is so vague and so wide a term that no interpretation can defeat it; and for my own argument, which now follows, it is as it were accidentally helpful, as privative prefixes like "non-" and "a-" are less objectionable to the modern thinker than positive exclamations like "truth" and "goodness" when used in a moralizing sense.

A succinct statement of my argument at first: in order to reach a modern, sophisticated definition of Ahimsa, it has to be divested of emotive and spiritual pomp; and in order to jell with Yudhisthira's quasi-canonical (and, to my feeling, justified) claim that it is indeed the supreme dharma, it must be universal. But to be universal, paradoxical though this must sound at first, it has to be narrow enough to permit the inclusion of a vast majority of moral agents who must reject a fundamentalistic, simplistic definition of ahimsa as total abstinence from inflicting any pain whatever. Now, as a counter-balance to the enormous amount of conscious and unconscious sanctimoniousness and the pompous diction of most of the indigenously Indian ahimsa-teachings of the Hindu Renaissance, i.e. of the last five or six decades, it is necessary, on the stylistic side, to introduce sophistication; without it, the intellectuals of all echelons of thought in the Western world and the upcoming generation in India which reads T. S. Eliot, Bertrand Russell, and Freud will not be attracted. The notion that style does not count in making followers is wrong and childish; remember that Aldous Huxley, among many others —the author of this paper among them—was driven out of his native religion very largely by the pompous and balmy diction of his catechets. Thus, the contemporary teacher of ahimsa as the universal moral law and as the supreme value must restrain himself; he must not fall into moralizing harangue. More and more, the young seeking mind, in India following the West, wants sober, superlativeless, and even adjective-less parlance; if ahimsa is to be taught as the supreme value—-perhaps "supreme" itself should be replaced by something less superlative—it should be couched in such terms as rational, conducive to an egalitarian society, liberal, pleasure-giving and not in such terms as spiritual, sublime, lofty, godlike, etc., for these terms are bound to drive away many potential listeners who have eaten of the tree of modern knowledge which is criticism and analysis.

So much for the new diction of ahimsa. Returning now to the need of narrowing down the definition of ahimsa for the sake of universalizing it: a naive, fundamentalistic, literal reading of it is bound to defeat its own purpose of universal acceptance. If, as some Arya Samajists, some literalistic Gandhians, and some Sanatani-oriented fundamentalists do, we insist on "no killing" as a blank order, well over 90 per cent of all potential listeners in the modern world will turn away; I am referring to the non-vegetarians, who constitute over 90 per cent of all mankind. Now I am perfectly aware—and pointed this out earlier in passing—that no "ought" can be derived from any "is"; the fact that most people do eat meat does of course not imply, logically or morally, that it is right to do so. The question is whether or not the eating of meat is morally wrong and on this point there can be two views. Personally, I hold that it is morally neutral, not on a literal, fundamentalistic interpretation of ahimsa, but on a universalized, narrowed-down, contemporary definition which is the theme of this paper—we are just working towards it but the reader must bide his time until we get there a bit farther below. On a literal, fundamentalistic reading of ahimsa it is no doubt wrong; but the question arises whether the retention of this fundamentalist reading does not bode more damage to the ahimsa-teaching in the process of its universal acceptance, in that it bars a vast majority of people from accepting it. In other words, may there not be greater harm in curbing the universal acceptance of ahimsa, to include the people and the powers that make and dispense the atom, than in the continued killing of animals for food? For given that the atom and the hydrogen bombs once do their nasty job completely, there will be no cowherds and shepherds to tend cows and sheep, nor any cows and sheep to be tended. And the pious hope that the sheer "spiritual" power of the teaching of ahimsa will persuade 90 per cent of humanity to desist from meat eating, is jejune utopia, particularly as the eating of meat is not regarded as morally bad even by a good proportion of the people from amongst whom the teaching originated, namely, the Hindus and the Buddhists. I find embarrassed silence among such vegetarian groups of listening bhaktas as Gujarati and Marwari speakers who have become devotees of Ramakrishna and Vivekananda, when they are told—and I think, for pedagogical and pastoral reasons they have to be told—that both of these masterful teachers of Hindu lore were fish and/or meat eaters, not due to a particularly contrived interpretation of the scriptures, but due to the anthropological fact that Bengalis have been eating non-vegetarian food as a matter of course, with the somewhat hapless attempts of Vaishnava reformers to stop the custom defeated in the long run of Bengali culinary history. And, of course, all intellectually honest pandits know that meat, including beef, had been one of the staples in Vedic and Puranic days. Yet, these arguments from "is" (or "was", which amounts to the same) do not imply any "ought" (or "ought to have been"); for a moral purpose, the above argument (involving the salutariness of the atom and of human versus cattle survival) is valid, because it is an all-out "ought" argument, involving no "is".

Actually, the only hitch about using a literalistic definition of ahimsa as a universal postulate lies in this dietetic realm; were it not for the historical accident that vegetarianism has acquired high prestige in India, so much so that it is one of the instruments for social climbing in the caste pattern, the fundamentalistic definition as implied by Gandhi and as usually accepted by vegetarian Indians would have sufficed for a universal definition, too. On the other hand, this very accident is fuel for the thinker's thoughts: the fact that a rather easy device—namely the not-eating of meat in traditionally vegetarian segments of India's population and the almost equally easy renunciation of meat by people who want to be different (I discountenance the very few who give up meat out of a feeling of emergent disgust)—has been used to hint at greater spiritual perfection is enough reason for the genuinely ethical thinker to reject status-giving vegetarianism as any means of moral agency. The official culture of modern India being puritanical to an excess, any action or omission that means less potential pleasure in a comparable situation confers greater prestige, as it adds to the ascetical Gestalt of the person who is persuaded and who wants to persuade his fellowmen that there is virtue in his renunciation. I do not say that vegetarianism has no merit; it has, but it is aesthetic rather than ethical, at least in the Indian context. I can see why a humanist or an intellectual in India or among Indians today refuses to eat meat or to drink alcoholic beverages when he does partake of both in non-Indian surroundings: a profoundly ethical mind would be annoyed at partaking in hedonistic pursuits—be they food, drink, or sex—where these pursuits or their omission carry a moralistic value, where they are loaded with value judgements of resentment or of emancipatory smartness. One often has the feeling among modernistic Hindus who have taken to drink and to meat and to extramarital sex that they do these things not so much for the fun but for the sin of them; but the humanist can be no partner to them—he enjoys these things for their pleasure or their inspiration, but not for some sort of surreptitious catharsis.

This much about meat food, the *bete noire* in a modern definition of ahimsa. If these arguments do not convince the ahimsa-fundamentalist, then he must not expect ahimsa to become a universal doctrine, not because people will not accept it (this would be a forensic inference from an "is" to an "ought" which is forbidden), but because all people do not have to accept it on purely ethical grounds, on the basis of the arguments I preferred earlier.

The way is now clear for a universally acceptable definition of ahimsa and I shall finally show that Yudhisthira's dictum may indeed be valid, albeit after a much more discursive and sophisticated process of thought than the old king ever dreamed of. This is the definition: ahimsa—nonviolence—is an attitude held by a person in all interpersonal situations, and implemented by that person in the majority of his inter-personal activities: the attitude of consciously inflicting no harm, or as little harm as possible, on other human beings.

This definition, of course, requires some elucidation. All moral introjections are attitudes; one does not "act" morally or immorally straightaway, for the physical act is strictly neutral. Each act accompanied by certain cogitations constitutes a moral or an immoral act, or of course a morally neutral act. If the surgeon cuts into his patient's cardial region to insert a plastic valve, he acts well, and probably morally, too; if he cuts into the same spot by exactly the same method, in order to get rid of his wife's paramour on the table before him, he acts immorally; and when he cleans his hands after the operation he acts morally neutrally, except of course for the ethical stickler who can, if he presses the matter very hard, find some moral correlation in each and every trifling act. "Inflicting" harm must include "permitting harm to be inflicted": if an American doctor drives along Highway 99 and does not stop to pick up a wounded person from the roadside because this makes him (the doctor) responsible for the man, he (the doctor) has consciously permitted harm to be inflicted on a person and is therefore guilty of himsa, violence. "No harm or as little harm as possible"—this is no facile watering-down of a moral doctrine, but a logically necessary emendation. "No harm" cannot always be done; there are millions of situations where a choice has to be made between greater and less harm. The famous case in point is that of the young man during World War II who came to Jean Paul Sartre to ask his advice: should he, as the Bible taught him, stay at home with Mama and serve her as he was her only son, or should he, as the Bible taught him, serve his country by joining the Resistance for training; Sartre told him to do what he had already decided to do when he came to him for advice: had he wanted to stay at home, he would have gone to some collaborating Padre who would have advised him to stay with Mama; the young man knew that J. P. Sartre was a member of the Resistance. No holy writ can help you in a moral decision in critical situations; and the average "be nice" injunctions which the world's religions have given *en masse* to last for hundreds of years yet to come are pretty facile and jejune—every sane adult knows that it is "bad" to steal and "bad" to fornicate with whosoever comes by—no Jesus and no Muhammad and no Srikrishna are needed to tell him that. The Sartre example is one from an historically specific critical situation. But examples abound in daily life in society that show that "no harm" cannot be done, and that the choice between less harm and more harm is incumbent on the person who would practise ahimsa. Take the matrimonial triangle, a ubiquitous pattern in all patriarchal societies: there is the married couple and there is the third person emotionally involved with one of the two. Now if there is no indulgence when emotion is strong and consuming, harm is done to two persons, i.e. the outsider and the married person who refrains from indulgence;

if they indulge and the other married partner finds out, it means pain to him and to the other two as well; if they indulge discreetly and if they can scheme it so that the horned partner cannot find it out, it would mean pain to none, unless they believe in a sort of Jungian common soul to which harm may be done in an indirect, abstruse fashion, or if they hold a Kantian categorical imperative enjoining actions whose maxims should be applicable for a universal legislation.

However the quantificatory approach to these marginal situations is dangerous, not for moral but for social reasons: in the first place, there can never be any guarantee for complete discretion; secondly—and more importantly, to my feeling—such involvement tends to put the involved persons on a constant defensive, it tends to jeopardize the affection between the married partners, and it will most probably affect the children of the marital union adversely. But, following G.E. Moore, these are not moral considerations—they are of a sociological, psychological, or of some other non-ethical nature; to assume them to be of moral significance is to commit the "naturalistic fallacy", the most frequent form of confusing the "ought" with the "is". And as ahimsa is a strictly ethical doctrine—unless it is taken in a Brahmanical-theological sense as the consummate state of the sage's mind, in which case it is a synonym of mukti, which sense does not concern us in this contribution—it belongs to the "ought" sphere alone; the consideration that some people do and some people do not act at the behest of ahimsa is totally irrelevant to our purpose of establishing a contemporary interpretation of the teaching.

Finally, in our definition, "no or as little as possible *conscious* harm"; it really goes without saying that unconsciously inflicted harm does not conflict with ahimsa; stepping on someone's toe in the Delhi bus, as someone else pushes one, is not himsa, unless one calculates on whose toes to land after being pushed, which latter case is a clear infraction of ahimsa.

I think I have shown within a brief compass a less inspiring, less simple, unsanctimonious, but in the long run more valid, and to the intellectuals of the modern world, a more negotiable version of ahimsa—one, I feel, the late Prime Minister Nehru might have been acting upon without formulating it.

THE TRUE SPIRIT OF SATYAGRAHA

R. R. Diwakar

The total renunciation of violence to life and property as a means for solving conflicts between nations has become more urgent than ever before. The discovery of atomic power and the testing and use of nuclear weapons have proved to be a threat to human civilization itself. So the necessity to find an alternative to war and violence is as great as finding a way for saving humanity from self-destruction.

Can satyagraha, as evolved, preached and practised by Gandhi, or any modification thereof, help humanity in this crisis? He often declared that satyagraha is a sovereign remedy against all evils, of course including the major evil of war. As early as 1914 he wrote: "Satyagraha is a force which, if it becomes universal, would revolutionize social ideas and do away with despotism and the ever-growing militarism under which the nations of the West are groaning and are being almost crushed to death, and which fairly promises to overwhelm even the nations of the East."

Satyagraha was evolved by Gandhi as an effective substitute for violent and destructive ways of fighting evil in the form of injustice, oppression and all kinds of exploitation. He used this method for resolving conflicts of interests and outlook, whether between individuals or groups. He used the satyagraha technique in all spheres of life.

We cannot, however, say that Gandhi had occasion to try his satyagraha technique in all kinds of conceivable situations in human affairs. For instance, what is relevant in the present context is the significance and applicability of satyagraha as an alternative to war and violence in international affairs. There were wars even during Gandhi's lifetime and we know what attitudes he adopted on various occasions and the appeals he made to the warring nations. But there was no occasion when he could have directly acted either to prevent war or to stop it by his methods.

It should, however, be remembered that the author of satyagraha lived and worked in the faith that it had infinite possibilities, that it was a sovereign remedy against all evils and that satyagraha alone would save humanity and lead it to an age of peace, harmony and happiness.

Satyagraha is basically a way of life in which truth and nonviolence, the realization of truth through nonviolence and loving action, is the ideal. Everything else, thought or acted, has to be subservient to that ideal.

Love and nonviolence in the broadest sense have been the most cohesive and cementing forces of human society and of human relations since the beginning of man's life on earth. The progress of human society from the tribal to the international level would not otherwise have been a possibility. From violence to nonviolence, from fear to fearlessness, from hatred to love, from the gross to the subtle has been the progress of civilization and culture.

While, thus, the trend of evolution is towards truth and nonviolence, towards construction and achievement, while the inner aspiration of man is towards the good and the true, the beautiful and the everlasting, untruth, evil, violence, hatred and destruction are still acting as anti-evolutionary forces. The progressive realization of the true nature and power as well as the increasing and effective use of goodness and truth, of love and nonviolence, is and can be the highest and the only goal of self-conscious humanity. The measure of success man attains in this venture is the measure of real progress in his evolution towards an ideal humanity, living in peace and joy and fulfilment.

Seen in this perspective, Gandhi may be said to have placed himself in the hands of the human evolutionary urge itself. He is the spearhead and symbol of future humanity. For him, the evolutionary urge meant predominantly the quest of the truth of life in terms of the needs of human progress, and its realization through the means of love and through action prompted by non-violence.

It is true that insistence on clinging to truth firmly, and defence as well as establishment of truth through nonviolent behaviour and through love and self-suffering, are not entirely new. They are as old as humanity and as ancient as the first emergence of saints. But Gandhi developed the technique not merely as a weapon to be used by individuals and almost entirely in the religious field but as a method which can be used by organized groups universally and in all fields and conflicts. It is this that has opened new vistas and inspired in mankind a fresh hope that this may be helpful not only as an equivalent of war but also for eliminating war ultimately.

True, Gandhi acted in a certain environment and led his people to success under given circumstances. He was faced directly with specific problems, the liberation of his own country being one of the most important of them. He solved many problems and that of liberation during his own lifetime. He organized and disciplined vast masses on nonviolent lines, though there were some occasional lapses on the part of his followers.

But it should be remembered that invasion of one country by another, international war, the replacement of war as an instrument for solving international conflicts, the solution of such conflicts by peaceful methods only, these were not the problems that he had to face directly as a satyagrahi. He has no doubt written a lot about all these situations, but they are in the nature of *obiter dicta*. The remedies which he has suggested indicate only the direction. Though he had no occasion to act and demonstrate his principles in the circumstances indicated above, he firmly believed that a nonviolent way was bound to be available for the solution of every problem in human relationship and that it was also bound to be successful. That he held this belief firmly and from the beginning is evident from his statements on many occasions.

The fact of the matter is that satyagraha is not a mechanical formula or a mathematical theory. It is a living, dynamic principle and philosophy of life which is yet to unfold itself and evolve fully. It may be said to be "the law of being" of coming humanity. It has yet to replace fully and effectively the operation of physical force and coercion in social evolution and social dynamics. Love, nonviolence, is the law of our species, no doubt; but it has yet to establish itself firmly and fully. Nevertheless it is progressively advancing. It is struggling, with reason as its helpmate, to control the irrational urges for possession and power of present-day humanity.

It is, of course, doubtful if organized political States as such will ever entertain a plan of action based on the principles of satyagraha because every State is founded on physical force as its basic and final sanction. That has been the theory of State since the beginning of all politics. In its dealings with its own subjects or with its neighbours a State may occasionally use methods which are in their externals somewhat similar to those of a satyagrahi, such as persuasion, negotiation, compromise and so on. But there the similarity ends. Nonviolent methods are used by States as being expedient or less costly but never as a principle of action or as the final sanction. Self-suffering, for instance, has no place at all in a State's policy. A State guides its steps mainly along the line of immediate as well as ultimate self-interest. So to expect at present even the smallest State to think in terms of the principles of satyagraha is to live in an imaginary world. It is equally futile to expect even the most powerful State, which keeps swearing by peace, to cease to add to its striking power. "Keeping the powder dry" is the only policy that all States follow. A State which would train and discipline its citizens in the science and art of satyagraha is yet to be born. Even India, which won its freedom by predominantly nonviolent means, has not been able, as a State, to do anything either in the way of unilateral disarmament or in the way of organizing a "nonviolent army".

But we need not despair at the fact that States, constituted as they are today, can never think in terms of satyagraha. Certainly such States as are not out for war, such as are peace-minded and in dead earnest to see that the ways of peace and friendliness are ultimately substituted for those of war and violence, can help create circumstances which would promote the methods of satyagraha by the people. They can certainly add to the common efforts of mankind to bring about an atmosphere of peace. They can do this both in the political and in the diplomatic field.

The first and most important step that a State could take to lessen the prevailing tension and the chances of war—I mean a major war—is to refrain from joining the power-groups, or power-blocs as they are called. This is a kind of "non-cooperation with evil". Of course, the question could be asked whether these nations which stand outside the blocs have themselves abjured violence and war as a means of solving international conflicts, and whether they have disbanded their armies and established the rule of nonviolence in their own areas. The obvious answer is that they have done nothing of the kind. And yet it cannot be gainsaid that they have helped by non-alignment in creating an atmosphere for peace, be it in ever so humble a way.

Following this first step could come complete non-cooperation, boycott and education of public opinion within the borders of the war-mongering States by a sufficiently well-organized group of non-bloc countries. They may use their collective influence to insist that there should be complete disarmament, that there should be no war henceforward and that means and methods other than violence and war should be brought into use, both for preventing international conflicts and for solving them.

When the organization of such States becomes powerful enough, their combined moral pressure on isolated power-blocs which are always on the brink of war is likely to be effective. Of course, the sanction behind such moral power of the non-aligned States would be the peaceful weapons of complete non-cooperation, economic and other nonviolent boycotts and so on. All this, if fully effective, would lead ultimately to total disarmament and to a world government. Then the only central authority wielding physical power would be the World Government. The

States would then have only municipal, judicial and administrative powers and would have no military sanctions either for defensive or offensive purposes. Attempts such as the League of Nations, the United Nations Organization and disarmament conferences are all leading us in that direction.

While this would no doubt be a great achievement, the world would still continue to be ruled by violent and coercive sanctions rather than by love and nonviolence, and there would still persist the need to preach and practise satyagraha as conceived by Gandhi, until such time as the rule of truth, friendliness and mutual cooperation is established throughout humanity.

Since wars begin in the minds and hearts of men and since the substitute for war also has to take root and grow there only, educating the people along those lines is essential as the very first step. This has been rendered easier now, since the evil not only of atomic war but even of atomic tests has come home to the people.

Today it is a well-known fact that the world is war-weary, that while the governments concerned are preparing for war, the people not only do not want war but definitely want peace. But at the same time they are afraid of aggression, of being conquerred by "others", by foreigners; they are afraid of losing their freedom. Obviously slavery is a continuous violence against the very soul of a people. It is natural that a people should prefer using violence to losing their freedom. It is therefore that they allow their governments to prepare for war while they themselves are hankering for peace. They realize that at best, war is a counsel of despair and at worst an invitation to death and destruction. But they have no effective alternative to offer to their governments. If we know how to organize nonviolent and peaceful forces in our own country and in the world, there is every hope that the organization of violent forces would break down. Nobody wants violence nor its triumph. There are no advocates for war as such. Even the worst war-mongers would say that war is but a necessary evil. They would avoid it if they could but they cannot, being caught up in a vicious circle.

When such is the situation, it is the moral duty of every individual and every citizen to line himself up on the side of "no-war" and see that he supports by some intelligent action the organization of nonviolent forces. Only sentimental revulsion from war would not be very helpful. Mere lip-sympathy or intellectual appreciation of peace efforts is no longer enough.

It should, however, be very clearly understood that there cannot be nonviolent action only by a single nation or its people. It has to be an international mass movement on the basis of "Peace workers of the world unite". Otherwise there is danger of subjugation by armed neighbours, which is worse than violence in defence of one's freedom.

The basic need of various peace-movements today, by whatever name they might be called, is of an organized and dedicated army of workers in all countries, of the type of the satyagrahis who enrolled themselves under Gandhi's leadership in India. The next step can be taken only when there is such an army to take that first step. The quality of the army is of very great importance more than its number.

The time for action would come when there shall be an army of men and women who are willing to act; then the technique of international action may be found along the lines of satyagraha. This would include passive as well as aggressive resistance to all those agencies which today directly or indirectly promote war and violence in the various States. Of course, such resistance should start only after all other types of persuasion have failed.

Such resistance may take any form, from simple non-cooperation to aggressive picketing even at the risk of being shot. This may include non-payment of taxes, boycott, social boycott of people who are ordering or directly manufacturing weapons of destruction, and so on. All these would depend upon the circumstances and the skill and tact of the local leaders.

But under all circumstances, nonviolence has to be strictly adhered to and the distinction between the evil and the evil-doer has to be scrupulously borne in mind. There should be the utmost readiness to suffer cheerfully the highest punishment and death, in the buoyant faith that truth—in this case the cause of nonviolence—will triumph. This is a nonviolent war against war and all the courage to face the worst has to be readily in evidence. That is the true spirit of satyagraha, the weapon of the brave against all evil.

GANDHI THROUGH THE EYES OF THE GITA

Marie Beuzeville Byles

Gandhi will be remembered in history because of his satyagraha campaigns and his use of the weapons of truth, love and non-violence to win self-government for India. But Gandhi said that "no one is competent to offer satyagraha unless he has a living faith in God".[1] And the *Bhagavad-Gita*, to which he would always turn for inspiration, is the allegorical description, not of a satyagraha campaign, but of the quest of the human soul for union with the Supreme or God. Further, in the eyes of the *Gita* the outward work that Gandhi did in liberating India and raising the depressed classes, is of no more importance than the work of a humble scavenger, while Gandhi himself ceaselessly reiterated that no work is superior or inferior. It was this quest for God that determined Gandhi's every action. And let us remember that when he said Truth is God, Truth did not mean only devotion to material facts. Far more important for him was devotion to the Inner Light that the rishis of India and the authors of the Upanishads told of and experienced.

It is therefore not through the pages of history but through the eyes of the *Bhagavad-Gita* that Gandhi's work and message must be studied if it is to be understood.

It was in middle life when I was escaping from the intellectual and materialistic agnosticism of university days that I happened to pick up from a second-hand bookshop a copy of Edwin Arnold's version of the *Bhagavad-Gita*, "The Song Celestial". I had not the faintest idea what it was, but it swept me away with its sublime wisdom. It seemed incredible that such insight could be crammed into such a small space. Shortly afterwards someone told me my ideas were rather like Gandhi's. Up till then Gandhi was almost as unknown to me as the *Gita*. I set to work to read everything I could find about him. His words gripped me in the same way as did the *Gita's*. Neither speaks through the beautiful veils and ecstacies of most religious literature. Both have a purity and simplicity related to everyday life.

When *Harijan* recommenced publication, Gandhi's words came like a weekly tonic. Somehow he was always utterly right, right because no speck of self-pride or incredible supernatural revelation spoilt the purity, simplicity and courteousness of all he said. When news of his death came, I wept with a personal selfish sorrow, for a guiding hand seemed to have been withdrawn. We cannot read a weekly message any more, but his words and writings have been collected, and through them, perhaps for the first time in history, we have the intimate detail of the inner life of a great public character and spiritual genius, from childhood until death. Especially we are indebted to V.B. Kher for having collected in three volumes, entitled "In Search of the Supreme", Gandhi's words on the spiritual aspect of life. As well as his own "Experiments with Truth", there is also Pyarelal's "Mahatma Gandhi: the Last Phase", which gives the intimate details of this quest during the last years. This quest for the Supreme is Gandhi's message and this quest must also be ours if we would follow in his footsteps.

All work is transient, and Gandhi's is no exception. To very few is given the task of taking part in satyagraha struggles. But we each have our own work, and it is our own work, however humble, that both Gandhi and the *Gita* would have us fulfil, and it is of the Mahatma's message in connection with our ordinary lives, that I would say something.

□

"It is better to do your own duty however imperfectly than assume duties of another person however successful; prefer to die performing your own duty; the duty of another will bring you great spiritual danger."[2]

And what is our own duty or work?

Under the ancient Hindu system of division into castes, or more correctly varnas, a man's work was determined by the hereditary calling of his father. The son of a sandal-maker must become a sandal-maker himself and a woman of course learned only the domestic arts according to the station in life of her father. The abuses of caste are so blatant that we of the West overlook the security and contentment that resulted from being born into one's own niche, and also the absence of cut-throat competition. Gandhi's ideas concerning caste or varna underwent considerable modification as his experiments with Truth proceeded and in the end he would probably have agreed that a man's proper work was that ordained by his nature. But he never gave up the idea of the need for division of labour,and from the beginning he asserted that no work was superior or inferior; the work of a Brahmin, of expounding holy truths, was not one whit better than that of a sudra who removed night-soil. He also consistently asserted that the work done for a livelihood must be done as a duty, and not for money making or one's own pleasure, and that it must never be changed for the sake of making a better livelihood. But of course one's bread-and-butter work does not prevent one's engaging in public service also.

Furthermore, even as there is no question of superiority and inferiority, neither is there any importance in success or failure. Success and failure are not in our hands, for all actions are the result of the working of the three gunas "and take place in time by the interweaving of the forces of nature".[3] Only the deluded man thinks that he himself is the actor. How utterly foolish, therefore, to imagine that the result of our work matters. The Stoics compared man to a messenger boy sent to deliver a parcel. The boy does his best to find the addressee, but if after making every effort he fails to do so, he has no personal interest in the fate of the parcel.

Gandhi's own work was only very partially successful. Self-government for India was obtained without violence or bloodshed. It was accomplished even without hatred for the British, with the surprising result that a person with a passport of the conquering race is welcomed everywhere as a friend, in a manner almost unbelievable and I should imagine unprecedented in history. But the innate tendency to hate was not sublimated; it was only repressed, and it came out in another way, in hatred between Muslims and Hindus. And the riots that followed independence were probably also unparalleled in history.

That Gandhi was unutterably cast down at the failure of his efforts to instil love and nonviolence, shows that even up to shortly before his death he had not wholly absorbed into his being the *Gita* teaching—and his own also—that success and failure are of no account. It was only by fasting that he was able to purify his mind of depression and regain the equanimity of a rishi. But the very fact of this human weakness and ability in the end to overcome it, perhaps makes his teaching more helpful than that of the rishis who are said to have dwelt always on the Himalayan heights of perfect serenity. It shows that he was human like ourselves and his heart speaks to our own as does that of Marcus Aurelius who also partly failed.

Those who have not absorbed the *Gita* teaching that success and failure are of no account and who suffered gaol and lathi charges, must find it hard to accept the truth that the "matchless weapon" of satyagraha that Gandhi brought into use is already being forgotten. When Martin Luther King started the desegregation movement in America, he did not consciously copy Gandhi's methods. The movement came into being of its own accord, and only after it was fully launched did its leader remember back to his reading of Gandhi and see the likeness of Gandhi's methods to his own. Gandhi's work did not influence the Negroes, but the same spirit that was in him is now in the sincerely practising Christians who follow Martin Luther King. In each case the work was not that of an individual, but the result of the "interweaving of the forces of nature".

Thus it is that all work, say both the *Gita* and Gandhi, must be offered to the Lord, or the Supreme, as a sacrifice, something to be made holy because it is done as a service to all.

When the universe was created, simultaneously the law of sacrifice, the opposite to creation, was brought into being, for the universe is composed of pairs of opposites.[4] The clouds give of themselves to make rain. The rain gives of itself to feed the earth which in turn feeds the plant. The plant flowers and fruits and gives up its fruit. "Except a corn of wheat fall to the ground and die it abideth alone, but if it die it bringeth forth much fruit."[5] The law of sacrifice is universal; and it is only at his peril that man tries to exclude himself from the working of this law. In the East it seems to be almost a universal custom to recognize that this law applies to man, by symbolically offering food to the God before partaking of it oneself. Because of the absence of this custom in the West, the meaning of verses 11, 12 and 13 of Chapter 3 is usually lost to the Western reader. Gandhi says that "Sacrifice means exerting oneself for the benefit of others, in a word, service. . . . Look upon all creatures as Gods".[6] That is to say, we must sacrifice ourselves for all, giving our work freely and asking nothing in return.

In Japan at the beginning of this century, Tenko Nashida, affectionately known as Tenko San, discovered this law for himself. He was in his late twenties when he woke up to the alarming fact that society consisted of individuals and groups of individuals each striving against each other and each seeking to get as much as possible and give as little as possible. He asked himself how a peaceful society, let alone a peaceful world, could be built on such an attitude. He gave away his property, and for three years wandered about Japan seeking a way out of the impasse. Finally he sat down to fast and meditate at a wayside temple. On the fourth day he heard a baby cry and its cries subside as its mother gave it her breast. Light came. We must give instead of trying to get. There is a law within the universe by which man can be delivered from suffering and this deliverance includes provision for his daily livelihood; but that law cannot come into operation unless, like all else, we learn to give freely without asking anything in return. He at once started to put this new found truth into practice by going from house to house asking for work without payment. He never lacked for food and lodging. Out of that first venture there came into existence the now flourishing community of 350 men, women and children known as Ittoen, the Garden of the One Light, with thousands of "lay" disciples throughout Japan.

Tenko San later found that Mahatma Gandhi had made the same discovery as himself and a plaque of the Mahatma is now in the International Hall of Ittoen.

Ittoen's men and women, youths and maidens will go anywhere and do any work provided only they can be the means of giving humble service to others. And that was Gandhi's passion also. It probably dated from the South African period, but in his "Experiments with Truth", he said it had become utterly necessary for him on his return to India.

Gandhi's interpretation of ch. 7 v. 17 is very interesting from this point of view. This verse describes the man dearest to God. It has been translated variously. Annie Besant translated it as "The wise, constantly harmonized, worshipping the one"; Mukerjee as "The wise, ever steadfast, fired by a single purpose"; Isherwood and Prabhavananda as "The man of spiritual discrimination"; Edwin Arnold as "He who is intent upon the One"; Mascaro as "The man of vision"; Radhakrishnan as "The wise one who is ever in constant union with the Divine and whose devotion is single-minded". But Gandhi said it is "Those who know what they are about and for whom service to others is something they cannot do without".[7] Again in the Eighth Chapter, Gandhi's interpretation of the bright fortnight of the moon is the path of selfless service.

Tenko San also made the same discovery as Gandhi concerning the need for complete sacrifice of self. Gandhi spoke of the reduction of self to zero. Tenko San said, "Death solves all problems; he who has any problems has not died to self." Chapter II of the *Gita* describing God the Destroyer is another chapter which by and large Westerners skip over because they are accustomed only to the idea of God the Creator. But Gandhi says we should read, re-read and meditate upon "God as world-destroying time into whose gaping mouths the universe rushes to its doom".[8] If we do this we see that we are mere morsels, the sense of self is lost and we realize the need for utter surrender and the reduction of self to zero.

Complete surrender to the Supreme and universal love towards all creation are the culminating notes of the *Gita*. "Who burns with the bliss and suffers with the sorrow of every creature within his heart, making his own each bliss and each sorrow."[9] "He who in this oneness of love, loves me in whatever he sees, wherever that man may live, in truth this man lives in me."[10]

But the culminating note of Gandhi's teaching was Truth. Truth is doubtless implied in every chapter of the *Gita*, but its necessity is never made explicit. Truth is not one of the things that Krishna describes himself as being.

The reason, I think, is that the *Gita* came into existence when people were simpler and when there was greater harmony between the conscious and subconscious mind, which latter was brought into daylight, as it were, by dreams and myths which to people in those days were real. When the *Gita* talks about the sacred fig tree of Aswattha, "the everlasting rooted in heaven, its branches earthward, its leaves a song of the Vedas", this to us is merely a pretty fancy. But to people of the age of the *Gita* it was real. It was real because it was part of the collective subconscious which dream-life showed to be a fact. Nowadays we treat the wisdom of the subconscious as beneath serious consideration—unless we are unusually devout disciples of Jung, perhaps!—and the result is that there arises a rift between the conscious and the subconscious. We deliberately try to repress the unpleasant darkness of the subconscious life and show always a respectable face to the world. The result is that self-deception and petty lies become the usual order of the day. However, whether this theory is or is not correct, it is a fact that untruthfulness is a vice almost unmentioned amid the many intimate details of virtues and vices and daily life told of in the many volumes of the Pali texts of primitive Buddhism. It is also a fact that today untruthfulness is taken for granted unless it is frightfully blatant. It was therefore utterly essential that Gandhi should place truth before all and state that Truth is God.

□

I have said that Gandhi's message in *Harijan* came to me as a weekly tonic for the living of daily life. But it is often asserted that the gospels of Gandhi and the *Gita* are impossible of fulfilment in a society based upon money-making and self-seeking just as much as upon petty lying, for very few can live in a community like Ittoen. People who make this assertion forget that Gandhi himself was a highly successful barrister before he espoused the Lady Poverty. It is obvious, these say, that a person who owns a shop would soon go bankrupt if he gave his goods away instead of exacting a proper payment for them. On the face of it, it would seem that in such a case he must place his own self-interest before that of a starving waif.

If in fact considerations like this do prevent living the teaching of the *Gita* and of Gandhi, then such teaching can have no meaning for us. But do they? It is the attitude of mind and detachment that matter, not the things owned or the work done—so long as the work done is that for which we are born—and does not injure others, the Buddha would add.

The man who owns a grocer's shop must obviously run it on ordinary business principles which include proper costing. If he feels called as a public duty to feed starving waifs, this too must be done on business principles, but here the means will probably be provided by donations of others as well as himself, and it will probably be done through a welfare society which in addition to giving food, will perhaps, like Gandhi, show the starving waifs how to give work in return for food. The test of whether this grocer is following in the steps of the Mahatma and the *Gita*, will be whether he is able to remain equable when someone defrauds him in his business, or when the hungry waif steals food he foolishly left open to temptation. The test is also whether he strives to make more and more money, instead of striving to give more and more service.

There is also another test even more down to earth, and this is the spirit in which we render little services to others, services which we are beholden to give. Most people give grudgingly, and expect thanks or a reward, or at least prestige. But the follower of the *Gita* will give because it is good to give; he will give his services as a thanks offering for being able to be in tune with the Law of Sacrifice. He will certainly not expect anything in return.

Another objection that is often raised to the possibility of living the teaching of the *Gita* and of Gandhi, is that we should completely exhaust ourselves if we "burned with the bliss and suffered with the sorrow of every creature". Those who make this assertion have no experience of the meaning of detachment, or of being detached from their own bliss and sorrow. If we cannot stand aside from our own joys and troubles, we cannot understand how it is possible to feel sympathetic joy and compassion for another without being emotionally involved. It is this attitude of detachment that makes the work of a good doctor or nurse of value. No parent, no matter how eminent a surgeon, would operate on his own child simply because he is emotionally attached and cannot stand aside and know true compassion which is without worry and anxiety. But the compatibility of compassion and sympathetic joy with perfect detachment is something that must be experienced to be understood. It cannot be explained intellectually to one who does not know it from actual experience.

It is true that the greater our power, wealth and prestige, the greater the difficulty in achieving perfect detachment, love and truth. It is significant that Gandhi gave up his membership of the Congress when he found it was compromising his quest for Truth.

None the less it has been found in every age and all religions that though one lives in the world, it is still possible to follow the teaching of the *Gita*. Mahayana Buddhism expresses this faith in the much loved Vimalakirti Sutra. The hero of this was a wealthy house-holder, but though he had wife and children as well as wealth, he observed the monastic rules, and though a layman he was universally proclaimed wiser than the greatest of the Buddha's monk disciples.

But let us make no mistake, if we aspire to be like Vimalakirti, the Pure One, we must make the quest for the Supreme paramount. That is to say, the things of this world, including its sensual pleasures, must play less and less part in our lives. God, the Light, the Oneness, or whatever we choose to call it, must become more and more a living experience, so that other things fade into the background and we become like Gandhi only "a dancer to the tune of God".

Christians who admired Gandhi would ask whether it was not the Presence of Christ that guided him. He replied (I quote from memory): "If you mean the historical Jesus, then I feel no such presence. But if you mean a Spirit guiding me, nearer than hands and feet, nearer than the very breath of me, then I do feel such a Presence. Had it not been for this Presence, the waters of the Ganges would long ere this have been my destruction. You may call it Christ or Krishna—that does not matter to me."

And that is the Gandhi we see through the eyes of the *Gita*, the only real Gandhi in so far as any perishable human being can be called "real".

1. V. B. Kher, *In Search of the Supreme*, III, p. 343.
2. *Bhagavad-Gita,* Isherwood's translation, p. 58.
3. *Ibid.*, Mascaro's translation, 3 : 27.
4. *Gita*, ch. 3; Kher, III, p. 236.
5. *Gospel of St. John*, II, ch. 12. v. 24.
6. Kher, III, p. 236.
7. Kher, III, p. 248.
8. Kher, III, p. 257.
9. Isherwood's tr., p. 86.
10. Mascaro's tr., ch. 6. v. 31.

GANDHI'S ILLUSTRIOUS ANTECEDENTS

Esme Wynne-Tyson

Rudyard Kipling's famous line, "What do they know of England who only England know?" could well be paraphrased, "What do they know of Gandhi who only Gandhi know?" It is quite certain that the majority of people only "know Gandhi". They are quite unaware of the long line of World-Teachers and idealistic philosophers of whose teachings Gandhi was the latest and one of the most consistent exponents.

To most people in the West he was a wise (or crafty) politician who played a leading part in ridding his country of its foreign yoke and so earned the title of the Father of the Indian Nation. They know that he was morally a good man and an ascetic who belonged to a Hindu sect which did not believe in taking life: hence his "queer" notions about diet. And there they usually leave the matter. But these inadequate, compartmental and unrelated facts do not begin to describe or explain Gandhi, the mahatma, whose teachings and whole manner of life were in the tradition of an age-old humane philosophy that I have renamed "The Philosophy of Compassion", and which is traceable in Western history from the time of Pythagoras, the first great exponent of the way of ahimsa in the West.

It is doubtful whether Gandhi knew much about Pythagoras, or his influence on Western philosophy. He was a man of action with little time for metaphysical studies. It was the English Theosophists who brought the great Hindu work, the *Bhagavad-Gita,* which was to become his Bible, to his attention, and even then the only time he found in which to study and memorise it was during his morning ablutions. We find in his *Autobiography*: "The operation took me thirty-five minutes, fifteen minutes for the tooth-brush and twenty for the bath. The first I used to do standing in Western fashion. So on the wall opposite I stuck slips of paper on which were written the *Gita* verses and referred to them now and then to help my memory."

This passage is significant in that it shows how little time he had for this sort of study, and explains why we find so few traces in his writings of the knowledge of the great Masters of thought whose tradition he so nobly upheld and whose way of life he semetimes exceeded in austerity. He led an extremely active life as lawyer, reformer and politician. Only by the integrated application of his rapier-keen legalistic mentality to the highest spiritual teachings of his countrymen was he able to gain so much of their meaning in the limited time at his disposal. Had he known more of Pythagoras and his way of life he would not, as a believer in reincarnation, have found the suggestion altogether fantastic that he might once have been this wise philosopher whose name is believed to have been a corruption of the Hindu "Pita Guru", or Father-Teacher; just as Pythagoras believed himself previously to have been Euphorbus, the son of Panthous, since he clearly recognized his own shield that he had used as a participant in the Trojan war where he possibly lost his taste for violence.

In his day, Pythagoras and his vegetarian-humanitarian community at Crotona in Italy were regarded as wonders of the Western world, even as Gandhi was afterwards to be regarded in the East. The Sage of Samos would greatly have approved of Gandhi's three disciplines. As the "Friend of Wisdom", he loved truth (satya) above all things. He believed, with the priests of Isis who taught him much of his wisdom, that the aim of life for man was to outgrow his animalism, and would certainly have agreed with Gandhi that this could only be achieved by the practice of brahmacharya. The keynote of the Pythagorean life was ahimsa so that, like Gandhi, the Sage of Samos deplored and avoided flesh-eating, the exploitation of the lesser creatures and animal sacrifice. In his *Metamorphoses* Ovid quotes him as saying: "Alas, what wickedness to swallow flesh into our own flesh, to fatten our greedy bodies by cramming in other bodies, to have one living creature fed by the death of another."

Complaining of Roman gluttony, Juvenal wrote in *Satire* XV: "What would not Pythagoras denounce, or whither would he not flee, could he see these monstrous sights—he who abstained from the flesh of all other animals as though they were human?"

If the present tendency towards flesh-eating continues to increase in India, it will be necessary for a twentieth-century Juvenal to arise to remind the inhabitants of the Pythagorean views of the Father of their nation.

Empedocles, a later follower of Pythagoras, wrote of the Golden Age referred to by his Master as being under the rule of a Goddess when "every animal was tame and familiar with men—both mammals and birds; and mutual love prevailed . . . nor had these happy people any War-God, nor had they any mad violence for their divinity. Nor was their monarch Zeus or Kronos or Poseidon, but Queen Kypris (the divinity of Love)."

Gandhi would have found it easy to worship this Goddess, for to him God was Love as well as Truth. In *Harijan* (26-9-36) he wrote: "If love or nonviolence be not the law of our being . . . there is no escape from a periodical recrudescence of war, each succeeding one out-doing the preceding one in ferocity."

His way of ahimsa was also the way of the Essenes, from whom, as we now know, Jesus of Nazareth gained so much of his wisdom. This vegetarian sect which refused to take part in animal sacrifice and were so strongly pacifist that they refused even to make weapons of war, undoubtedly found a resurrector of their faith and teachings in Gandhi of the twentieth century. Above all, they saw the necessity, as he did, for the practice of brahmacharya for one who aspired to evolve to a higher species than the present "Centaur" man, half-animal, half-human—and to be delivered from the miseries of life lived in the flesh. Pliny describes them as "a solitary race and wonderful above all others on the globe; without women, renouncing all usual enjoyment, without money. . . . From day to day they are recruited by the flocks of newcomers whom the world drives from itself, all tempest-tossed by the way of fortune. In this way, incredible to tell, the race wherein no birth ever takes place, has endured for thousands of years, so useful for recruiting their numbers is the disgust of other men with the world." This description of a sect so like the Early Christians as to have been confused with them should be compared with Jesus' statement, puzzling to his modern followers, that in the kingdom which he came to establish there would be no marriage nor giving in marriage.

The descriptions of the Essenic communities given by Philo Judaeus, and Josephus who was one of their students, sound like blueprints for the Gandhian ashrams in which, as those who have read Gandhi's *Autobiography* know, brahmacharya as well as ahimsa was obligatory. Yet nowhere in his writings have I found any indication that Gandhi even knew of the existence of the Essenes. He was inspirationally reviving and reteaching a philosophy that has been resisted and repressed in the West since the original Christian Gospel was replaced by the State- serving and supporting Churchianity that has plagued and befuddled humanity since the reign of Constantine, when in order to gain the power and prestige of being the official religion of the Roman Empire, the Church abandoned its essential policy of nonviolence, and its congregations were no longer forbidden to bear arms in defence of the State. Since that date the gap between Churchianity and the philosophy of compassion, on which the teachings of the Essenes and the life of Jesus were based, has gradually widened. An attempt was made to bridge it by the Neoplatonists, and for a time the philosophy of Plotinus found in his famous *Enneads* seemed to have effected this reconciliation. In *Origen and Greek Patristic Theology*, W. Fairweather writes of Neoplatonism that "at the commencement of the fourth century it had become the prevailing philosophy in Christian as well as pagan circles". As it included the wisdom of Vedanta, it might well have led to the spiritual unification of mankind. But the theologians of the victorious "Christian" church which had triumphed over its pagan rivals, continued to invent the most impossible doctrines until, by the sixth century, it became evident, even to the theology-loving Emperor Justinian, that it was impossible to reconcile the two ways of thought: religion as it had become as the result of theological tampering, and the philosophy of religion which had been able to clarify the earlier teachings. So, as the cooperation of a powerful and well-organised Church was necessary for the support of the tottering Empire, *philosophy* had to go. Justinian closed the doors of the Academy of Athens where, until then, it had been preserved and banished the philosophers with their sanity. Small wonder that this folly was soon followed by what is rightly known as The Dark Ages.

Some vestiges, however, of the ancient philosophy survived in the works of classical Western writers and in those books by the pagan philosophers that managed to escape their periodic burning by Church and State. One of these, although part of the fourth and final book has been lost, was Porphyry's famous treatise on *Abstinence from Animal Food.* In reading this, one is constantly reminded of the words and views of Gandhi. He and Porphyry, who was the disciple of Plotinus and the editor of his *Enneads*, would have been in complete agreement on their view of life. Porphyry quotes Diogenes as saying: "Thieves and enemies are not found among those that feed on maize, but sycophants and tyrants are produced from those who feed on flesh".

Throughout his treatise this ardent advocate of ahimsa answers conclusively all the objections of flesh-eaters to a harmless diet, and leaves them, dialectically, "with not a leg to stand on". This book would have enormously appealed to Gandhi and it is surely significant that it has been reprinted in translation very recently after over a century during which it has not been available to the general public, for it at once confirms and calls attention to the deepest teachings of Gandhi at a time when even his own countrymen seem in danger of forgetting them. It also shows how he has once again provided that bridge of a spiritual unification that was so earnestly sought after in the fourth century and demolished by the act of Justinian. Let us hope that it will be recognized and used by those who wish to maintain what Dr S. Radhakrishnan has called "the Idealistic View of Life", and not be once more rejected for a lower ethic.

The indifference found in the West to the Gandhian philosophy is usually excused by the argument that Gandhi was not a Christian. But, in fact, as I discovered as a result of my researches for my book, *The Philosophy of Compassion*, what he taught and practised was much nearer to the original gospel of Jesus Christ than anything taught and practised by the Churches that profess to be Christian.

Gandhi explained in his *Autobiography* that the reason why he would not call himself a Christian was that he could not accept what he rightly considered the immoral doctrine of vicarious atonement. "I do not seek redemption from the consequences of my sin", he said to a Plymouth Brother who was trying to convert him: "I seek to be redeemeed from sin itself, or rather from the very thought of sin".

This was precisely Jesus' way of salvation, the way of rebirth by water (total purification) and of the Spirit (gnosis, or wisdom), as he explained to Nicodemus (John 3:5). To be "saved" a Christian must follow his celibate Exemplar in thought, act and life. He must, as Paul was later to describe it, "put on the Mind of Christ".

The doctrine of vicarious atonement, a wholly Judaic concept, was just the sort of primitive idea that Christianity was meant to replace. It was introduced by Jewish theologians, in particular the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews, long after the crucifixion. Gandhi's method of self-purification and the outgrowing of animalism was the way of Jesus Christ, as it was also that of the Essenes, the idealistic philosophers and the founders of the pre-Christian Mystery religions.

Jesus said: "Ye shall know the Truth and the Truth shall make you free". Gandhi declared that "Truth is God", and that God is the only liberator. Gandhi was a pacifist who taught his followers the way of nonviolent resistance. Origen, the great Alexandrian Father of the Church, wrote of Jesus that he had "forbidden entirely the taking of human life", and said: "No longer do we take the sword against any nation, nor do we learn war any more since we have become sons of peace through Jesus".

In the present century those still calling themselves Christians have already taken part in, or given their consent to, two world-wars, with the blessings of their apostate Church; yet they can consider the nonviolent Gandhi as less "Christian" than themselves!

Gandhi deplored the cruelty and violence involved in modern *materia medica* and advocated, instead, nature cure and spiritual healing. Jesus not only taught and practised spiritual healing, but his early followers understood this to be part of the Christian way of life, and were practising it in the time of Origen, who tells us in his book, *contra Celsum*, that he had "seen many delivered from serious ailments and from mental distractions and madness, and countless other diseases which men had failed to cure" (Book III: 24). Yet the modern "Christian" churches, with the exception of the Church of Christ Scientist, insist on the cooperation of a medical service based on animal experimentation and vivisection described by Gandhi as "Black Magic", even when they are trying to effect a cure by "faith" and "prayer". The more logical Gandhi, referring to spiritual healing by practising the presence of strength-giving Ramanama, writes: "To claim belief in Ramanama and at the same time to run to doctors do not go hand in hand" (*Truth is God*, p. 31).

As a lawyer, Gandhi revered justice and therefore found it easier to believe in the doctrine of reincarnation than in the untenable idea propounded by the Christian theologians of a new soul being born with every body yet somehow achieving immortality, despite the fact that whatever has a beginning must have an end. Gandhi wrote in *Truth is God*: "I am a believer in previous births and rebirths". In this he was not only in agreement with the great thinkers of the ancient Western World—Pythagoras being quoted by Ovid as saying: "Our souls are immortal, and are ever received into new homes, where they live and dwell, when they have left their previous abode"—but also with the Founder of the Christian Faith who proclaimed, "Before Abraham was, I am"; and taught man's co-existence with God in the words: "I and my Father are one". Nor did he rebuke his disciples when they said that his hearers believed him to be a reincarnation of some former prophet; indeed, he confirmed the doctrine by positively stating that Elisha had been reborn in John the Baptist (Matthew 17: 11-13). The "Orthodox" teaching of the

Resurrection of the body on Judgment Day was an illogical concept borrowed in pre-Christian times from the Zoroastrian religion, and afterwards perpetuated by Christian theologians who preferred anything to agreement with the pagans. Augustine of Hippo complained bitterly of how this teaching was scoffed at by pagan critics who asked "whether the abortive births shall have any part in the resurrection? . . . They pass to deformities . . . misshapen members, scars and suchlike; enquiring with scoffs what forms these shall have in the resurrection. If we say they shall be taken away, then they come upon us with our doctrine that Christ arose with his wounds upon him still. But their most difficult question of all is, whose flesh shall that man's be in the resurrection which is eaten by another man through compulsion of hunger? For it is turned into his flesh that eats it. . . . Whether, therefore, shall he have it again that owned it at first or he that eats it and so owned it afterwards? These doubts are put into our resolutions by the scorners of our faith in the Resurrection." It is noteworthy that the distressed Bishop did not attempt to answer these rational arguments.

As a man of law, as well as a man of God, Gandhi taught, as Jesus had done, that what a man sows he reaps, and that rebirth alone can make this harvest possible in the majority of cases.

How wonderfully Gandhi understood the Mind of Christ is seen when we compare Matthew 22:37, 38 where Jesus proclaims the great commandment of the law to be: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind", with Gandhi's statement in *Truth is God* (p. 16) where he writes: "Those who would make individual search after truth as God, must go through several vows, as for instance, the vow of truth, the vow of brahmacharya (purity)—for you cannot possibly divide your love for Truth and God with anything else—the vow of nonviolence, of poverty and non-possession."

This passage reads like a description of the life and conduct of the Founder of the Christian Faith. But in which Christian Church are these vows taught? Clergymen preach as though they were almost entirely unconcerned with the first and great commandment, especially ignoring the word "all" which shows what our first allegiance should be. Instead they concentrate on the subsequent commandment advocating love for the brother man, and give it precedence over the first. But it was no accident that both Jesus and Gandhi ranked it *second* in importance. Jesus told his hearers that they must love their neighbour as themselves but we do not worship ourselves, and should not become obsessed with the human self, either that of our own or of others. What is required is to meet its genuine needs and then leave it free for its real occupation of seeking and finding God.

Instead of which, by concentrating on mankind to the exclusion of the wisdom and Truth which is God, we are ruining the characters of the beneficiaries of Britain's Welfare State by spoon-feeding them with material benefits while depriving them of a spiritual philosophy of life which is incompatible with the creed of scientific materialism; while the Freudian psychologists continue to mislead them ethically and morally, especially on sexual matters. With the immense increase of promiscuity, illegitimate births and venereal disease, there is an urgent need for true sex-instruction; but no one has the courage, or is given the opportunity, to teach as Gandhi did that "the man who is wedded to Truth and worships Truth alone, proves unfaithful to her, if he applies his talents to anything else. How then can he minister to the senses? A man whose activities are wholly consecrated to the realization of Truth, which requires utter selfishness, can have no time for the selfish purpose of begetting children and running a household. . . . Hence one who would obey the law of ahimsa cannot marry, not to speak of gratification outside the marital bond." (*Truth is God*, p. 34.)

Does not this passage clearly explain what have been considered the "hard" sayings of Jesus found in Luke 14:26 and Matthew 10:36, 37: "A man's foes shall be they of his own household. He that loveth father or mother more than me is not worthy of me: and he that loveth son or daughter more than me is not worthy of me", together with his further proclamation: "I am the . . . Truth".

That this point of view was understood and accepted by the early Christians for centuries after the Ascension, is proved by the fact that Origen castrated himself to make certain of his entry into the heavenly kingdom! This was a mistaken materialization of what both Jesus and Gandhi intended to be a purely spiritual process, but at least it established proof of the fact that originally the followers of Christ understood that brahmacharya was essential to salvation. Why has no modern church dignitary arisen to teach this unpalatable but undoubtedly *Christian* truth to Western congregations? Does it mean that our Bishops have less moral courage than Gandhi, and prefer their present undignified arguments about "oral pills" to the risk of unpopularity? Have they failed to note that "he who would save his life must lose it" applies to Churches as surely as it does to individuals? All must be sacrificed to the Truth that Gandhi called God.

In a letter written in 1942, and quoted by C. F. Andrews in *Mahatma Gandhi: His Own Story*, Gandhi wrote: "I do not consider myself worthy to be mentioned in the same breath with the race of prophets. . . ." Owing to his great humility, it is doubtful whether he ever changed this opinion. Nevertheless, inasmuch as he taught the same liberating Gospel as the greatest Teachers and philosophers of the West as well as the Rishis of the East, it is impossible not to include him among their number. For, as both he and Jesus taught, it is the Truth that sets us free, and it was undoubtedly that Truth which we can now so clearly trace through the teachings of the wisest men of the human race, that Mahatma Gandhi reintroduced to a world that had done its best to forget it. This is always the sign and seal of the divine, or evolved, man: he teaches nothing new, but always advocates the age-old method whereby man can evolve to a higher species, the species that the Teachers themselves, from Pythagoras to Gandhi, have exemplified in their purified and noble lives.

TAKING SARVODAYA TO THE PEOPLE

R.R. Keithahn

Gramdan sarvodaya is a movement of the people towards total freedom. It grew out of India's great nonviolent struggle for political freedom. But it was always a fundamental part of that significant struggle. It is true that it was primarily a movement of the national leaders; but to their credit and to the credit of Gandhi in particular, they had a profound sense of the deep-felt needs of the people and always tried to make the immediate program that of the people. One remembers so well when Vinoba came to the Madurai district. With hestitation we set for ourselves a goal of 25 gramdans. Then we were experiencing unusual success. Vinoba asked, "How do you explain this?" I replied, "You have sensed what is already in the hearts of the people; that is why there is a remarkable response". Of course, this was but partly true.

Food, clothing and better housing are certainly felt-needs of the people. Thus the "land to the tiller" program strikes a responsive note in the heart to the needy. The khadi program has had remarkable success in a land of need at a time of great world industrialisation. It helps the helpless who have no money to buy cloth to clothe themselves. Thus there are always ready responses to a cottage or village industries program that meets a real need. It is true that we need good technicians and capital;

we need to solve the problem of marketing. However, in the original Khadi and Village Industries Program we started at such a simple level that these latter needs were insignificant. The wastes of the village were used to meet real needs.

Unto the Last

There has been a surprising response to bhoodan and other *dan* programs. As some of our local Kannavaipatty people said to a question, "Why did you become gramdan?" The immediate reply was, "We were getting poorer and poorer. We saw no other way out." In the recent efforts for gramdan in the Tirunelveli district, where several new gramdans have been secured in recent months, it has been remarked that most of these are small hamlets and involve the poorest of the village people. Sometimes we say that our efforts have not reached the very poor. In December 1963, at Gandhigram, Jawaharlal Nehru reminded us several times during the day that we had not gone down to the neediest. However, in the bhoodan and the gramdan movement we must recognise that this noble but difficult aim of sarvodaya has been achieved to a very large extent. Even in the Constructive Program much has been done, and is being done, in reaching this goal. How many hungry have been helped in the khadi program during these several years! How many helpless and needy untouchables such as the scavengers have been aided by the Harijan Sevak Sangh. Certainly the program for a national language and special attention to the vernaculars has taken into consideration the lowliest who could never think of any education in English. The program for women and children again has been for the very needy. I have seen much of the work of the Kasturba Memorial Trust. Especially when I went to the balvadis, and at the beginning of such a program, I would see naked children, suffering from malnutrition, being helped. Certainly, in the work with women in this area we have dealt with the very needy. In Gandhi's program for labourers and students he went to the neediest. Basic Education surely has the needs of the neediest in mind as well as the welfare of all. The leprosy program has been directed towards one of the needy sections of our population. The bhoodan and gramdan movements have continued this emphasis.

Special Challenges of Today

All of us are painfully aware of the passing of another of our outstanding national leaders. We have yet to appreciate the unique contribution of Nehru in formulating a great nation building program. For the moment I am thinking primarily of the Community Development Program which now covers every village in India. India is a land of villages. At least 80 per cent of our people still live in the village. Perhaps food is the outstanding problem of India. The village provides for the nation the answer to these basic needs of people: food, clothing and housing. However, it is my conviction that a rural-based society alone can produce a rich and lasting culture and civilization. The foundations of a democratic, socialistic society can only be provided by a village-centred nation. If we are to have a substantial spiritual base I am convinced that it must find its foundations in the villages. We are stressing cooperation in India today. The natural forms of cooperation are always evident in a village economy. If there is any truth in my claims, then sociologists must study this aspect of social life most carefully that we may know best to develop in the future.

Feeding the Hungry

The bhoodan movement recognises the need for land being in the hands of the tiller. It is a nonviolent attempt to solve this serious problem. I am quite convinced, as I watch our struggle for more food in India, that we cannot provide such until every agricultural labourer owns the land on which he works. There cannot be any absentee ownership. Here again, there must be a careful study out of which must grow a definite and nonviolent national program. Gramdan is a natural approach to cooperative farming and village industries. Again it is my conviction that if we are to have a natural and substantial Co-operative Movement in India it must flow from the people themselves. It cannot come from the Government. The Government can and will play a very important part in such a movement. However, it must be fundamentally an expression of the people concerned. When the people work together, facing this large food problem of India, then only can we feed all adequately.

In solving the food or any other problem in the village we must face the need of minimum physical strength. We cannot expect hungry people to work hard, to have the needed initiative, to take the necessary leadership, to have the needed morale and to rise above an animal level of existence. The present economic system brings food to the people who are able to buy it. It does not provide adequate food for the men who produce it. This is most unjust. Gramdan is working towards this end. The public must be more sensitive to and more cooperative with this important approach to another of our great national problems.

Rural workers are constantly stressing the need for kitchen gardens. However, in many villages the local family has no place where they can even construct a latrine. There must be a minimum of land in each village for each family. Where villages are crowded, we can resort to common gardens and orchards. This kind of cooperative effort is not easy. However, it must be attempted. In our health programs we must stress the preserving and increasing of food values. For example, a common procedure in our South Indian villages is the germination and sometimes the sprouting of grams, pulses, millets and maizes. By this often important and protective food values are increased 10 per cent and more. When we are deficient in food these methods are extremely important.

We must also give more attention to the proper use of the soil. New buildings are often built upon good soil. This should be prohibited unless absolutely necessary. We have so many stony and dry places that it is a crime in these days to fill up a rice field to build a building thereon. The question arises also in my mind whether we should not plant millions of palmyrah and other sugar producing trees in sandy and dry areas where they will grow and thus release good wet lands from the necessity of producing sugar. It is also a fact that we are using more sugar than needed. If this is true, then we should educate our people. In this connection, I am convinced that more of our millets and maizes can be used in the preparation of our biscuits and breads.

That again would help us to improve our diets and increase our food supplies. I suggest these practical programs because it is at this point that gramdan workers can make a substantial contribution to Government efforts.

I would also stress the sanitation program. "Cleanliness is next to godliness." Health is essential to a good social program. Gandhi made scavengers out of his workers and this had many implications. The Government and the gramdan movement have still to make one village clean. We cannot have sound health without cleanliness. We need all of the village wastes to feed the soil if we are to make our efforts most fruitful. Gandhi again taught us the importance of composting night soil. We are tending to get away from this important emphasis. I know of no place that is seriously taking up the composting of night-soil and other village wastes. Even the Sanitation Institutes are not facing these potentialities as seriously or as effectively as they might.

Harijan Seva

Perhaps the most significant aspect of Gandhi's Constructive Program was Harijan Seva. When I see what has taken place in India and compare this with what is taking place after one hundred years of similar service in the U. S. A., I am profoundly impressed by the work in India in regard to this serious problem. There is no question but that we must work for a "casteless classless society". I believe this is the desire of our people. The Government has made substantial contribution to the solution of the problem of the "outcaste". However, the sarvodaya movement might do much more. There are many amenities offered to the Harijans. Again and again, these do not reach them because there are no proper channels. The last few days parent after parent has come to me for help to buy books, etc. It is a noble thing to want better education. However, so many of the poor people cannot afford it, especially of the Harijan groups. Here again, we need common funds set aside for special needs. In many cases there might be inter-marriages, the common use of wells, common projects; but this is not accomplished because the leadership is not as active and courageous as it ought to be.

Abundant Life to Women and Children

One is always impressed by a balvadi or any other good work for our village women and childern. In many of our villages there have been chit funds so that village homes might have better utensils. We have had several workshops for mothers. We try to open up to them this wonderful new world in which we are living. We try to give them a few techniques that will be significant for their family life. We have found them most cooperative. Personally, I have been concerned about family planning. I am not thinking of this need in any narrow sense. Great changes are taking place in the village family. Old traditions are being broken. New developments are taking place. However, this is not being done thoughtfully and with careful planning. There are many traditions that are useless or harmful. There are others tremendously significant for the development of the new family in a sarvodaya society. What are the new patterns of family life that are important for such a society? How can cooperation be emphasized in the home so that the family may participate more fully and effectively in a cooperative village? There needs to be careful family budgeting of resources and time. I repeat that it is a great joy to see this work taking place in our villages. However, we still touch only a small percentage of such villages. If we could do such work in every gramdan village we would be giving substantial support to the whole community development program of the Government. One wonders whether the Government should not set aside more funds to assist such important work.

Basic Education

India has yet to understand the full meaning and appreciate the significance of Basic Education, especially at the village level. It pained me yesterday to hear that the Education Department was sabotaging Basic Education by not providing cotton at least for the schools ready to take up this project seriously. Surely, an experienced educationist must recognise the importance of the training of body, mind and spirit. The use of a craft like the cotton craft helps in the integration of such training and especially in the village situation. But even more important is the need for the complete integration of the village school and the community development program. When Ponnuraman of Kottaipatti returned from Israel he said that he was most impressed by the care of the children on the part of the various communities in Israel. He suggested that if there was a village hostel in connection with the Basic Education school in his village this would help gramdan greatly. Surely, the patterns of cooperation in the gramdan village, and now in all of India, are most important. If the community is to be trained in cooperation it must start at the school. Here again the Government should help us to carry on pilot experimentation.

Gramdan Sarvodaya

Gramdan sarvodaya is a program for the "welfare of all unto the last". The Government has made significant contributions towards panchayat raj. This can only be implemented by full cooperation on the part of the villagers and village-level workers. In our area we are making a special attempt to have regular monthly mahasabha meetings. This reminds one of the old Town Meeting of New England which became the foundation of American democracy. Certainly we cannot expect any other such foundations than those which will be made in our villages. These village assemblies elect their own panchayats which become the administrative channel for the decision of the mahasabha. In the Batlagundu area, common projects are growingly seen in the gramdan villages. Slowly common funds are being started. Common labour programs have been initiated. In the Government development program provision has been made for Volunteer Forces. In Tamilnad we are making special efforts to have village Shanti Senas. We still need to develop a rural youth movement. Some good work is being done. However, such work must be made more universal. At least in three gramdan villages in this area land has been shared with the landless. However, it is becoming clear to me that this sharing cannot go on indefinitely. For example, in Kannavaipatty the absentee landlords own more than the people living in the village. There is no other solution of the land problem: the absentee landlord must give his land to the landless. The people are slowly being organized to carry out such a program. However, all resources in India, both Government and non-official, must be mobilized to solve this serious problem. Only then can we truly take sarvodaya and all good Government programs fully to the people, especially as we try to produce more food.

Spiritual Foundations

Gandhi constantly reminded the constructive workers that he was giving them a very difficult program and that it could not be carried out unless all had "a living faith in Truth (God)". I have already suggested that the faith of the common villager is remarkable. It must be given more substance. It must be channelled more fully into difficult daily living. However, Vinoba constantly reminds us that the existing religions are insufficient for the need, that we must have a reunion of spirituality and science. Certainly, there is much that is valuable for the present and future in the great religious traditions of India. We are fortunate in having here all of the great and living religions of the world. However, and unfortunately, these religions are dividing us. All too often, they hinder us as we move into a new social order. Fortunately, there is a rich prophetic element in each one of these religions to which we can appeal. A growing number of our leaders are becoming sensitive to the importance of the prophetic elements in the Buddha, in the Prophet, in the great prophets of Israel, in Jesus Christ and in present-day prophets. India has great spiritual traditions and resources. During these recent decades we have had outstanding spiritual leaders here in South India. There are still some who are helping us. However this area of our social life needs attention. I am quite convinced that we cannot do our best in the gramdan sarvodaya program of the Batlagundu area until sensitive, cooperative men and spiritual leaders of vision come together and plan a constructive programe to encourage spirituality and science. Just as we plan for the new family so also must we plan for a new and substantial spiritual expression that will make itself felt at every point of need and progress.

EPILOGUE

THE ESSENCE OF GANDHI

G. Ramachandran

Gandhi was a many-sided personality. The outward simplicity of his life and his single-minded devotion to nonviolence cloaked innumerable deep currents of ideas, disciplines, loyalties and aspirations. He was at once saint and revolutionary, politician and social reformer, economist and man of religion, educationist and satyagrahi; devotee alike of faith and reason, Hindu and inter-religious, nationalist and internationalist, man of action and dreamer of dreams. He was a very great reconciler of opposites and he was that without strain or artificiality. He loved greatly and accepted unreservedly that truth can reside in opposites. No one has yet attempted a complete analysis of his complex and magnificent personality. We have all come too much under the spell of the astonishing integration and unity of the man within himself. It was Rabindranath Tagore who once wrote that those disciplines are the most complex which finally lead to the utter simplicity of a great song. One has only to look at those who learn music to see the daily grind of hard discipline through which they must pass before they bring out a soulful song. Gandhi's life was one long and ceaseless saga of endeavour in which he added, bit by bit and piece by piece, to his stature culminating in the advancing fullness of his personality. There was nothing mystic or miraculous about his development and growth, from a common man into the unsurpassed mahatma of our history. It is open to each one of us to see how he advanced, step by step, gathering innumerable fragments of truth one by one and piecing them together in the crucible of his life, ready to look at facts, understand their significance, face any consequence in the pursuit of a cause, suffer any penalty for a mistake, recover lost ground again, but always advancing, open-minded and without fear and dedicated selflessly to reach and hold the truth of a matter at any cost. He was, therefore, not born a mahatma. He grew into one. He was a common man who pulled himself up to most uncommon heights. He was no god, but became a god-man. Gandhi knew this about himself and that was why he called his biography, "The Story of My Experiments with Truth". Experimentation was one of the deepest passions of his life. He experimented with food, health and cure, clothes and dress, politics and economics, education and reform, organisation and revolution, ethics and spirituality, with almost everything that his life knew as part of life. With relentless logic and courage he broke new ground in every direction and yet had the depth and width of mind to separate defeat from success, the false from the true, the unreal from the real and to integrate all his aims and achievements into the unity of his personality.

But when we look into the splendid mosaic of his thoughts and deeds there is one thing which stands out as unique and puts him in the forefront of the evolution of man in our time. This was the unique discovery he made in a unique laboratory. The laboratory was South Africa and the discovery was satyagraha. It was history which threw Gandhi into the South African laboratory. The situation in South Africa was itself unprecedented in history. It was not merely that a White minority Government brutalised itself and millions of coloured people in an attempt to permanently enslave them. Slavery was nothing new in the world, but this one was unique in that it was grounded in a new metaphysics and ethics buttressed by modern science. Every thought and action conceivable to diabolic human ingenuity was drawn upon to perpetuate the subjection of the many who were weak to the few who were strong. Any rebellion was totally made impossible. The very thought of rebellion was made treason. The White minority Government was armed not only with weapons but with perverted laws, institutions and philosophy. This slavery itself was held up as part of God's plan for man and the teachings of the New Testament were blackened and poisoned in support of it. The Bible had taught through twenty centuries that God made man in His image, but the White tyrants in South Africa taught that this applied only to the White man and never to the coloured man. The many who were weak and held in subjection had no arms, no organisation, no education, no power of any kind. They could work and manage to live only within the unbreakable boundaries of their slavery. Once they accepted their slavery, they were fed, clothed and given shelter, but without any human rights whatsoever, not even for a husband to live with his wife, nor a mother with her children. They could live like cattle in the cattlesheds of this fantastic civilisation. Any attempt to break away was met with torture and death. It was a terrible prison house within the heart of modern civilisation. History cast Gandhi into such a prison house. He had lived and studied in London. He was a Barrister-at-law. He was an Indian with a great and ancient tradition of culture in his blood. He was, however, young and inexperienced. He could have turned tail and run away from this terror. It was at this point that Gandhi revealed the first glimmer of his greatness. He stood firm and looked at the terror with unflinching eyes. Can we not say, in humility today, that God broke into history at this point and gave Gandhi the inner urge to stand firm? He had behind him only unlettered, poor and weak Indian coolies and he himself was dubbed a cooly barrister by the arrogant Whites who kept the keys of the prison. The historic challenge before Gandhi was whether the weak could fight the strong with any hope of redemption. Throughout history in all the battles between the strong and the weak the weak had always surrendered or perished. Gandhi asked himself the question if the inescapable fact of history, as it appeared to be, could ever represent the law of truth, justice and love, i.e. the law of God. Again, God broke into the soul of Gandhi and Gandhi knew at once that what surrounded him was really the negation of the law of history and the law of God. That settled, he plunged into the experiment to discover a weapon with which the weak could fight the strong.

Many ingredients went into the experiment of Gandhi in South Africa. The first was Gandhi's unalterable belief in God. To Gandhi, God was truth, justice and love. Truth and justice were concepts, but love or hate furnished the motivation for action. Hate was acting in South Africa. Could love be made to act effectively in the same area of human life? Gandhi's inner mind said, yes, it can because it must. Otherwise, God would be defeated, i.e. truth and justice would be defeated. That was impossible! This was the logic of Gandhi. How then could love be made to act? Certainly it could not be made to act in the manner hatred acted. Suppression, torture, violence, the prison and the bullet were the instruments of hate. These must be rejected as instruments of love. But what could be the instruments of love? Having come to the conclusion that love must reject the weapons of hate, Gandhi set about to discover the instruments of love in the battle of the weak against the strong. Discoveries came to him one after the other. The weak must not surrender. The weak must not obey. Instead of inflicting suffering, the weak must invite suffering on themselves and put the tyrant to shame and make his weapons as useless as possible. This must be done collectively by the entire Indian community. Large masses of people must act together nonviolently. Gandhi was modern enough to understand the significance of numbers which he did not disdain in a mood of super-saintliness. He realised at once that it was his duty to disobey iniquitous laws and make all his people also disobey them. He understood why the White minority Government used cruel violence to suppress coloured people. It was only under suppression that the coloured millions, including Indians, would give unmurmuring obedience. The whole aim was to secure obedience through terror. Gandhi's answer was to create fearlessness and inaugurate disobedience. Disobedience suddenly became the only duty. But there could be violent disobedience! Gandhi discovered that violence weakened disobedience and still left the initiative in the hands of the tyrant who was the master of the art of violence. Disobedience became more effective when it was nonviolent. Gandhi thus arrived at this strategy of effective disobedience through nonviolence. Here was the unassailable logic of nonviolent disobedience. Disobedience and surrender are poles apart. Disobedience was the exact opposite of surrender. If the tyrant secured no obedience from the slave what would happen? He would punish the slave, beat him up, throw him into prison, shoot at him with bullets. Yes, the tyrant was bound to do all these. So Gandhi said to himself and his people that disobedience should persist in spite of everything the tyrant did. The tyrant could torture, imprison and kill a few people, but he could not do that to the whole of the people when they were nonviolent. Therefore, the larger the number, the better. But the question was, would the weak disobey in sufficiently large numbers and face the consequences of disobedience? Here Gandhi's mind hesitated. Then he quickly came to his next discovery. There was a soul in each human being. Whatever might be the differences between human beings due to different circumstances and conditions of history in recent centuries, man himself who was several hundred thousand years old on earth had each one a soul equal to every other soul. God created man in his own image, said the Bible. God resided in each human being, said the *Gita*. The Buddha and Mohammed affirmed the same truth. Gandhi was a believer. He decided heroically to act upon the basis of the equality of human souls. From that belief sprang the faith that there was no man or woman so small, weak or helpless who could not discover the strength of the soul inside and make use of it when life itself was in peril before tyranny. Gandhi put his faith not only in the transcendent God but the God immanent in every man and woman. Gandhi thus pieced together all these fragments of truth and welded them into a new courage and hope. Thus, step by step, the experimenter in the laboratory of South Africa arrived at his radiant discovery of the power of passive resistance which later evolved into the revolutionary weapon of satyagraha.

Gandhi at once applied his discovery to the situation. He gave the call to his people to awake, arise and act nonviolently. They were only poor, weak and illiterate coolies who had long submitted to tyranny and knew the pains of slavery. But they responded to him in the most astonishing manner. Gandhi's faith in man was justified. What happened as passive resistance grew and advanced is now part of history. It startled the Whites in South Africa and flashed the message of a new revolution across the world. The coolies began civil disobedience. The Whites became angry. They struck out at Gandhi and his coolies with all their weapons. Thousands were thrown into prisons, properties were confiscated, crowds were beaten up. Disobedience continued nevertheless. No Indian surrendered and no Indian obeyed. No Indian weakened in the struggle because of the beatings and the prisons. It became a long drawn out struggle of seven years which ended in the Smuts-Gandhi agreement. The struggle ennobled the coolies, gave them confidence and self-reliance. The Whites were ashamed inside themselves and were cleansed a little. The Whites were Christians. The coolies showed them the meaning of the Cross. Both sides emerged from the struggle with a premonition that something new had happened to them equally. The world had changed a little, not only in South Africa but in the conscience of man. Tolstoy wrote to Gandhi that the struggle he organised in South Africa was important for the whole world. More than everything else Gandhi himself was a transformed man. Deep within him there stirred the first awareness of a great mission and we witness the rebirth of the man Gandhi into Gandhi the Mahatma. Mahatma literally means the great soul. That was an apt title which Dr Annie Besant and poet Rabindranath Tagore combined to confer on the transformed man from South Africa.

This then was Gandhi's discovery in his laboratory of South Africa. It was the discovery of a weapon with which the weak can fight the strong. It is perhaps the greatest discovery of our century. It was a greater discovery than that of atomic power in our time. Atomic weapons are now in the hands of the mighty and with these weapons the strong will fight the strong and destroy themselves. But here was the discovery of a weapon which the weakest could use with effect against the strongest. Non-violence was certainly older than Gandhi. But Gandhian non-violence is altogether a new thing in history. Under the technology of satyagraha, Gandhi threaded nonviolence in a chain reaction and then harnessed its redemptive power to revolution, thus knocking out the idea that the essence of revolution was in violence, blood and terror. Gandhi proved that there could be massive nonviolent action against tyranny and injustice which could shake both to pieces and at the same time redeem alike the tyrant and his victim. Gandhi's courage, his faith in the common man, his power to organise love in action, his iron determination and his power of analysis and synthesis which he applied to his experiment in South Africa, require a much fuller study than any undertaken so far.

Gandhi was the discoverer of a new dimension in nonviolence and he opened a new chapter in history. No longer need the world be divided always between the strong who must dominate and the weak who must surrender or perish. That was true only so long as might alone could settle the right. After Gandhi, there is a new vista which has opened up before man. If only the weak could know, there would never again be subjection and slavery anywhere in the world. Gandhi brought back with him his new weapon as he returned to India. Later in India, after a process of slow and laborious preparation of himself and the people, he marshalled millions of his countrymen to plunge into three great tides of nonviolent revolution. The first was the non-cooperation movement in which he trained India to know that India was in subjection because of Indian cooperation with British rule and the moment that cooperation was withdrawn, British rule would collapse. The second was the salt satyagraha movement which when started excited the ridicule of the British masters, but who later realised to their dismay, that they could no longer hold India in subjection against its consent. Finally came the Quit-India revolution which ended British rule in India for ever and launched the nation on the road to independence and the Republic. What astonished the world, however, was that when the British left and India became independent, there was no rancour left in the minds of either India or England. It looked as though the last act was more one of a great reconciliation than a parting. The Republic of India voluntarily chose to remain in the Commonwealth. Is it any wonder then that the great historian and thinker, Arnold Toynbee, recorded later that Gandhi had liberated not only India but also Great Britain.

Let us not be lulled into thinking that the impact of Gandhian nonviolence on world events does not appear to be clear or effective. Outwardly the world seems to have little to do with Gandhi and satyagraha. The two mighty powers, the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. dominate the world scene largely because they both possess atomic weapons of incalculable destructive power. We have then the emergence of China as a world power. Civilisation is in the grip of competition and violence. The image and challenge of Gandhi appear small on the world horizon. But that image and that challenge will steadily advance into the twentieth century and on to centuries yet to come. Since the end of the second world war there have been several groups in the world which have practised satyagraha against tyranny and injustice. The Negroes, in the mainstream of their struggle in the United States under Martin Luther King, have firmly grasped this new weapon in their hand. But this stream of nonviolence is still only a trickle against the background of the tidal waves of violence sweeping the world. These tidal waves represent the decay and death of civilisation. The trickle of nonviolence, which is very slowly but steadily gathering strength, shows the way onward to a great renaissance of the human spirit with the possibility of building a new human society based on freedom, justice and peace. India owes a special duty to mankind because it was in India that Gandhi was born, lived, worked and gave his life for nonviolence. The Gandhi Centenary will arrive in 1969. Will the people and the Government of India take a deep breath and recapture for themselves and for the world the true image of Gandhi in the next few years before the Centenary? There cannot be the slightest doubt as to what Gandhi wanted India and the world to do for the future of man. But have we the courage and the integrity to live up to Gandhi's challenge? This is one of the biggest question marks before the world today.

INDEX

Abernathy, Ralph 233
Abstinence from Animal Food 362
Alcott, Bronson 13
Ahimsa 3, 9, 15, 17, 129, 133, 143, 168-9, 270, 279-80, 282-4, 314, 321, 327, 329, 331, 333-40 (see also *nonviolence*)
American civil war 226-9, 280
American Friends Service Committee 201
American Peace Society 226
Andrews, C.F. 195-6, 367
Angell, Norman 160
Anti-Nuclear-Arms Convention 165, 167
Aquinas, St Thomas 294
Arjuna 122
Arms race 184-5
The Arms Race 263
Asoka 6, 7, 15
Assisi, Francesco d' 75
Atom bomb 161, 242, 272, 274-5, 279
Augustine of Hippo 365
Aurelius, Marcus 10, 351
Azad, Abul Kalam 155

Ballou, Adin 35
Bardoli 45, 116
Basic education 83, 258, 369, 373
Beer, Samuel 102
Bentham, Jeremy 325-6, 330
Besant, Annie 381
Bhagavad-Gita 3, 122, 143, 242, 270, 308, 324, 334, 348-9, 351 354-7, 359, 380
Bhudan 53, 369-70
Bigelow, Albert 202
Bismarck 230
Bolsheviki 39
Bondurant, Joan 91, 114, 144, 157, 205, 285, 311
Bonhoffer 76

Bose, Rabindra Nath 284
Bose, Subhas Chandra 142
Boston Peace Convention 35
Bowles, Chester 203
Brinton, Crane 90
Brinton, Howard 11-2
Buddha 4-6, 16, 114, 119, 280, 355, 375, 380
Buddhism 6, 8, 354
A Bunch of Old Letters 283
Burritt, Elihu 227

Camus, Albert 220-1
Canby, Henry Seidel 13
Case, Clarence Marsh 25, 41, 227
Chaco Wars 182
China 131, 140-1
Choisy, Maryse 92
Christianity 10, 33, 75-6, 361-2
Christian love 197
Christian non-resistance 70
Christian pacifism 25
Christians 11, 31-2, 68, 75-6, 204, 223, 255, 257, 351, 361, 363
Christians, early 10, 29, 361
Christian truth 11, 367
Christ, Jesus 9-10, 16, 18, 31-3, 67-8, 73, 280, 339, 356-7, 360-1, 363-7, 375
Christmas Island tests 287
Churchill, Winston 160
Church of Christ Scientist 364
Civil disobedience 13-4, 90, 100, 147, 149-50, 200, 211, 227, 288, 317, 379, 381
Civil rights movement 88, 108-9, 151, 197, 203-4, 209, 211-6, 218-9
Clayton, Cranston 197
Cold war 184, 249-50, 279-80
Committee against Jim Crow in the Armed Forces 200
Committee for Nonviolent Action 219
Committee of Federal Organizations 209, 216
Committee of One Hundred 92-3
Committee of Racial Equality 46, 199
Common arket, European 301
Commonwealth, British 382
Community development program 370
Congress of Industrial Organizations 229
The Conquest of Violence 91, 114
Conscientious objectors 228
Constructive work 84
Contra Celsum 364
Cooperative movement 370
Co-ownership 259-60

Darkness at Noon 328
Datta, Dhirendra Mohan 282
Debs, Eugene 39
Decentralization 258-60, 296
Delhi-to-Peking friendship march 205
Dell, Floyd 89-90, 94
Demilitarization 182
Demintry 259
Democratic Values and the Prac-

tice of Citizenship 166
Dewey, John 102
Dharna 105
Direct Action Committee Against Nuclear War 46
Disarmament 180-2, 185-90, 224, 263-64, 289, 345
Disarmament, nuclear 183
Disarmament, unilateral 165-7, 169, 178, 183-4, 189-91
Diwakar, R.R. 88, 91, 289
Dodge, David Low 226
Donne, John 175
Duragraha 99-102, 107-11
Duragrahi 101, 108

Einstein, Albert 170, 273
Eisenhower, Dwight 173, 214-5
Eliot, T.S. 335
Emerson, Ralph Waldo 13
Ends and means 321-31
Ends and Means xv
Engels, Friedrich 326
Enneads 361
Essenes 360,363
Evers, Medgar W. 209

Fairweather 361
Farson, Negley 196
Fellowship of Reconciliation 36, 199, 203, 227
Ferdinand, Archduke Franz 174
Fischer, Louis 205
Fox, George 11, 32, 302
Freud, Sigmund 176, 335
The Friend 24
Fromm, Eric 173
Fullbright, John W. 215
Gaitskell, Hugh 183
Gandhi x-xvi, 44, 76, 83, 119, 130, 137, 291, 298, 310-1, 318, 326, 347, 349-51, 376, 382; and civil disobedience 146-7, 381; and the Congress 140-2, 144, 356; and the *Gita* 353, 355, 359; and Hitler 285; and industrialization 258; and Marxists 145-6; and Negroes 203; and nonviolence 132-3, 148, 171, 271, 280, 282-3, 313-5, 337, 358, 380; and nuclear weapons 266; and pacifists 23-5, 251; and politics 262, 308; and satyagraha 285, 289-90, 307, 341-2, 346, 348, 377, 383; and spirituality 123; and the West 195-6, 202, 204-5, 257, 378; and unilateral disarmament 189, 191, 244-5, and the U.S. peace movement 206-7; and World War II 243; consistency in 312; his relevance ix; Jain influence on 8; misrepresentations of 139; on the atom bomb 242, 279; on the constructive program 47, 177, 369; on himself 138; on Jesus 68, 357; on karma 241; on means and ends 309, 321-4, 327-31; on morality 16, 134; on the Negro struggle 197; on nonviolence 18, 22, 47, 85, 143-4, 252, 267, 270; on peace 250; on satyagraha 45-8, 99, 105, 109, 111, 122, 129; on self-

renunciation 17; on the Sermon on the Mount 9; on the State 316; on Thoreau 14; on Tolstoy 11-12, on trusteeship 317; on truth 15-6, 120-1, 246, 264, 281, 292-3, 303, 354, 379; on violence 108; on war 172, 174, 178-9, 249, 261
Gandhian constructive program 18, 47, 177, 205-7, 329, 369, 372
Gandhi and Stalin 205
Gandhi centenary 383
Gandhigram 369
Gandhi, Kaba 14
Gandhi on World Affairs 205
Garrison, William Lloyd 35-6, 227
Georgia 217
Ghaffar Khan, Abdul 149
Goa 131, 139, 142, 287
Gramdan 53, 368, 370-2, 374
The Great Illusion 160
The Greek Passion 175
Gregg, Richard B. 92, 129, 143, 195, 205, 227
Grimke, Thomas S. 226
Grotius 292-3, 299
Gunther, John 196
Gyan Chand 52

Hague Conference 188
Hammarskjold, Dag 295
Harijan 68, 349, 354, 360
Harijans 83, 91, 372
Harijan Sevak Sangh 369
Hind Swaraj 321
Hinduism 4, 16, 29, 333
Hitler, Adolf 147-8, 154, 160, 188, 197, 240, 243, 255, 276, 285
Holmes, John Haynes 195-6
Hopi Indian nation 37
Houser, George 199
Howard University 205
Hume, David 325
Hunter Commission 148
Hunter, Robert 229
Huxley, Aldous xv, 122, 335

Independent Labour Party 39
Indian National Army 142
Indian National Congress 140-1, 144-5, 155, 307, 315, 356
Indian national movement 315
Indian war of independence (Indian mutiny) 141
Industrial revolution 254, 260
Inside Asia 196
International law 292
Irwin (Lord) 142, 147
Israel 374
Ittoen 352-3, 355

Jalianwala Bagh 148
James, William 177
Jaspers, Karl 290
Jefferson, Thomas 225
Jehovah's Witnesses 38-9
Joad, C.E.M. xi
Johnson, Lyndon 175, 215-6
Johnson, Mordecai 203
Johnson, Paul B. 216
John the Baptist 364
John, the Gospel according to St 363

Jones, E. Stanley 196, 282
Jones, Rufus 196
Journal of Conflict Resolution 205
Justinian 362
Juvenal 360

Kachongva, Dan 37
Kahn, Herman 188
Kalinga War 15
Kalki 270
Karma 322-3, 327
Kashmir 131, 139, 141, 165
Kasturba Gandhi Memorial Trust 369
Kautilya 324, 326
Kazansakis, Nikos 175
Kennedy, J.F. 181, 215
Khadi 83, 308, 368
Kher, V.B. 284
Khruschov, Nikita 181
Killing No Murder 324
The Kingdom of God is Within You xii, 11
King-Hall, Stephen 170
King, Martin Luther ix, xv, 81, 94, 132, 210, 216, 232-3, 287, 351
Kipling, Rudyard 358
Korean War 201
Krishna 354, 357
Kumarappa, Bharatan 24
Kumarappa, J.C. 145
Kuper, Leo 25

Labour movement 198
Lathrop, John 226
Law of the harvest 82, 84
Lawrence textile strike 198
Lead Kindly Light 205
League of Nations 188, 246, 275, 346
Lenin, V.I. 326-7
Leprosy 369
Lester, Muriel 196
Liebnecht, Karl 39
Lincoln, Abraham 175
Lippman, Walter 175
Little Rock 214
Lloyd, Selwyn 181
Lohia, Rammanohar 52
London, Jack 230
Lowell, James Russell 227
Luke, the Gospel according to St 366
Luthuli, John 290
Luxemburg, Rosa 39
Lynd, Staughton 205

MacArthur, Douglas 172
Macdonald, Dwight 206
Machiavelli, Niccolo 324-6, 329
Macmillan, Harold 286
Mahabharata 3-4, 334
Mahatma Gandhi: His Own Story 367
Mahatma Gandhi: the Last Phase 349
Manu 3, 276
Maritain, Jacques 323
Materialism 253, 255, 257
Materia Medica 364
Matthew, the Gospel according to St 364-6
Mau Mau 148
Mays, Benjamin 151, 197
McCarthyism 114, 200

Mein Kampf 148
Menninger, Roy W. 173
Mennonites 223
Metamorphoses 360
Meyer, William H. 12
Miller, Webb 196
Millis, Walter 182
Mississippi 90, 209, 212-8
Mohammad, Prophet 380
Montgomery bus boycott 44, 71, 202-3, 232
Mooney, Tom 230
Moore, G.E. 340
Moral resistance 34-5, 49
Morris, Jones 311
Mother India 278
Mukherjee, Hiren 311, 317
Muste, A. J. 51, 197-9, 202-3

N.A.A.C.P. 209-11, 215
Narayan, Jayaprakash 156
National Labour Relations Act 229
Natural law 292-3, 295
Nazis 77, 148, 160-2
Necodemus 363
Negroes 46, 108, 122, 127, 197, 200, 202-3, 209-13, 215, 217-8, 232-4, 288
Nehru, Jawaharlal ix, 4, 17, 140, 142, 157, 173, 196, 283, 287, 340, 369-70
Nelson, William Stuart 204
Nevada Action 202
New England Abolitionist Convention 36
New Testament 9, 15, 31, 34, 223-4, 378
The New York Times 219
Niebuhr, Reinhold 197, 228
Noel-Baker, Philip 263
No More War 24
Non-alignment 142, 345
Non-cooperation 99-100, 150, 164, 345, 347
Non-cooperation movement 382
Non-possession 317
Non-resistance 29, 35, 69-70, 73, 89-90, 223
Nonviolence xiii, 3-5, 8-11, 14-8, 22-6, 49, 67, 72, 74, 76-78, 80-1, 84-5, 87-9, 99, 110, 113, 132, 139, 143-4, 151, 155, 166-9, 171, 197-8, 201-3, 209-10, 217, 221-2, 228-9, 231, 233-4, 245-6, 251-2, 267, 276-9, 294, 309, 313-4, 317-8, 322, 338, 342, 344, 360, 380, 383.
Nonviolence, generic 26, 28
Nonviolence in an Aggressive World 198
Nonviolence, types of 64
Nonviolent action 76, 139, 145, 148-51, 153, 157, 167, 199, 200, 287
Nonviolent Action against Nuclear Weapons 202
Nonviolent direct action 31, 45, 47, 195, 231-2, 286
Nonviolent resistance 22, 81, 113, 116-9, 196, 207, 223, 233
Nonviolent resistance and direct action 26-8, 34, 49, 55, 81
Nonviolent revolution 28, 48-52, 205, 382
Nuclear bomb 244, 260, 262

Nuclear deterrence 286, 289
Nuclear pacifism 287
Nuclear war xvi, 244, 254, 266, 271-3

Organization of American States 183
Origen 363, 366
Origen and Greek Patristic Theology 361
Ovid 360, 364

Pacifism 22, 25, 34, 54, 67, 195
Pacifist 80-3, 204, 213, 251, 360
Page, Kirby 196
Panchayati raj 308, 374
Passive resistance 42, 69, 71-2, 314
Patanjali 120
Paul, Alice 231
Paullin, Theodore 25
Paul of Tarsus 75
Paul, St 363
Pax Romana 295
Peace 39, 204, 244-5, 247-50, 253-4, 292, 294-5, 301, 346-7
Peaceful resistance 43-4, 47
Peacemakers 200-1
Peace movement 185, 196, 198, 200-1, 204, 206, 228, 234
Peace movement, radicalism in 198, 201
Peace worker 250, 293, 295
Penn, William 224-5, 302
Phillips, J.B. 68
The Philosophy of Compassion 363
Plato 294
Pliny 360
Plotinus 361
Polaris Action 202
Poqo 92
Porphyry 362
The Power of Nonviolence 91, 195, 205
Power, Paul 205
Prasad, Rajendra 165, 167, 178
Prohibition 307
The Public Philosophy 175
Pugwash Conference 190
Pyarelal 287, 349
Pythagoras 358-60, 364, 367

Quakers 10-11, 15, 32-3, 196, 223-5, 231, 251, 295
Quit India movement 382

Racial justice 197, 199, 200, 204
Radhakrishnan, S. 154, 249, 362
Rajagopalachari, C. 167, 169 272
Ramayana 3
Randolf, A. Phillip 199, 200
Reconciliation 24
Religion 11-2, 16-7, 175, 191, 268
Richer by Asia 205
Rogers, Carl R. 124-5
Rolland, Romain 121, 195
Roosevelt, F.D. 117, 199, 229
Roosevelt, Theodore, 222
Round Table Conference 196, 317
Ruskin, John 331
Russell, Bertrand 176, 272-3,

287, 335
Rustin, Bayard 199-200, 287
Sacco and Vanzetti 40-1
Salt march 83, 196, 382
SANE (National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy) 202
Sartre, Jean Paul 175, 339
Sarvodaya 373, 375
Saturday Evening Post 203
Satya 321, 331 (see also *truth*)
Satyagraha xi, xv-vi, 44-6, 89, 91, 99-100, 102-4, 107, 109-11, 122, 125-6, 129, 133, 150, 153, 168, 191, 195, 197, 206, 271, 285, 288-90, 307, 314, 317, 341-2, 344-9, 377, 381-3
Satyagrahi 46-7, 87, 101, 106-8, 121, 127, 243, 314, 343, 376
Scott, Lawrence 202
Scott, Michael 50, 93-4
Sermon on the Mount 9, 31, 73, 115, 158, 223
Sexby, Colonel 324
Shanti Sena 155-6, 252, 374
Sharp, Gene 70
Sheean, Vincent 205
Shridharani, Krishnalal 153, 195
Sibley, Mulford 25
Sit-ins 232-3
Sizwe, Umkonte We 92
Smith, Adam 286
Smuts-Gandhi Agreement 381
Snow, C.P. 93
Socialism and war 326
Socialist Labour Party 39
Socialist Party 38-9
Society of Friends 10, 31, 223
Socrates 94, 271
South Africa xi, 15, 138, 377, 379
Speak Truth to Power 201
Stalin, J. 137, 147, 328
Stevenson, Adlai 172
Stimson, Henry L. 117
Stoics 350
The Story of My Experiments with Truth 119, 144, 349, 359, 361, 363, 377
Stroup, H.H. 40
Student Nonviolent Co-ordinating Committee 203
Student Peace Union 202
Sutherland, Bill 202
Swaraj 315-6

Tagore, Rabindranath 159, 376, 381
Taylor, Edmund 205
Templin, Ralph 199
Tenko San 352-4
Tertz, Abram 327
Their Morals and Ours 327
Thomas, Norman 41
Thompson, Allen 219
Thoreau, Henry David 13-4, 227, 287
Thurman, Howard 151, 197
Tillich, Paul 282
Tinker (Professor) 312
Tobias, Channing 151
Tolstoy, Leo 11-2, 15, 32, 150, 381
Toynbee, Arnold 382
The Trial Begins 327
Trier, Herson 326

Triple revolution 212, 220
Trotsky, Leon 326-7
Truman, Harry 117
Trusteeship xiv, 317
Truth xii, xiv, 11, 15-7, 37, 75, 78, 117, 120-2, 133, 171, 246, 253, 281-2, 285, 292-3, 299, 302, 308-10, 313, 326, 330-1, 356, 365-7, 375
Tucker, Benjamin 230
Twentieth Century 93

Unesco 293
Unilateral initiatives 184-5
United Nations xv, 13, 163, 181, 183, 190, 275, 285, 296, 301-2, 346
Unity 195
Unto This Last 391
Upanisads 3
Urban League 211

Versailles, treaty of 255
Vimalakirti Sutra 356
Vinoba 53, 155, 164, 166-70, 249, 272, 368, 375
Voltaire 176
Vykom satyagraha 46

Wade-ins 232
War xv, 10, 35, 37-42, 50-1, 82-3, 86, 153, 158, 160, 164, 172-5, 177, 179-82, 184-6, 188, 216, 220, 225-8, 248, 253-4, 256-7, 263, 271-4, 297, 298, 302-3, 342-3, 345-6
War Resisters League 219
War Without Violence 153, 195
Washington Post 13
Wells, H.G. 7
White Citizens' Council 219
Women's International League for Peace and Freedom 227
Wordsworth, William 130
World Development Year 302
World Pacifist Conference 24, 201, 203
World Peace Brigade 205
World Refugee Year 302
The World Tomorrow 197
World War I 38-9, 186, 188, 228, 241
World War II 22, 39-40, 181, 186, 206, 228-30, 240-1, 243, 255, 274, 287

Yadavas 273
Yevtushenko, Yevgeny 328
Yoga Sutra 120
Young India 309
Yudhisthira 335, 338

[illegible].M. College of Education
R[illegible] Punjab
Acc. No. 2344 (D)
Dated 27/4/2016